

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME I NOS. 3, 4

(VOLUME LXV OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1951

ΑΓΚΑΘΕΝ

Aesch. *Agam.* 3, *Eum.* 80, 373.

THIS word, glossed ταῖς ἀγκάλαις at *Eum.* 80 and (by Triclinius) ἐν ἀγκάλαις at *Agam.* 3, has accordingly been taken by everybody in the former passage and by most in the latter to be a formation from ἀγκάς (or ἀγκάσι) and to mean properly 'from the arms'; in which case it could, of course, within the conditions of the well-known Greek idiom, mean 'in the arms' where the context might require that as the English equivalent. It has remained only for Professor Eduard Fraenkel to push the traditional text of *Eum.* 80 to its logical conclusion and seriously to suggest that, in the case of this (very rare) word (*only*), a Greek could use the suffix -θεν with a meaning exactly opposite to its normal meaning. In his note on *Agam.* 3 he writes that both here and at *Eum.* 80 'we must recognise the meaning *in ulnis* (so Hermann, better perhaps *in ulnas*)'. Here 'the Watchman (like the watchdog) lies as it were thrust forward "into his arms", with the upper part of his body between them'. But to explain a text thus is not to explain it at all. Nor in fact have the problems involved ever, so far as I can see, received a thorough investigation.

Eum. 79-80

μολῶν δὲ Παλλάδος ποτὶ πτόλιν
ἴζου παλαιὸν ἀγκαθεν λαβῶν βρέτας.

The speaker, it is essential to remember, is Apollo.

It does not seem to have been appreciated that, if ἀγκαθεν here is related to ἀγκάσι, the Greek is unequivocal.¹ Such expressions (notoriously common) as γούνων λίσσοιτο λαβῶν . . . κούρην (*Od.* vi. 142) and (still more) ἀγκάς δ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην (*Il.* xxiii. 711) must determine the sense for 'take hold of the statue by its elbow', a suppliant posture for which there is no authority. Unquestionably we have to deal with some corruption; and the form ἀγκαθεν, which appears in Hesychius and elsewhere glossed ἀνέκαθεν, was demonstrably known to scribes and does in fact occur by corruption in this very play, at 373, where J. Pearson's correction ἀνέκαθεν is proved by metre. The epic ἀγκάσι, which I proposed in *C.R.* 1 (1936), p. 54, will not account, neither would the Aeschylean ἀγκάλαις², for the hard core of the corruption, the here unnatural suffix -θεν. What will do so, and generally follow the *ductus litterarum*, is ἀλκαθεῖν, a form attested for Aeschylus (as is ἀλκάθω for Sophocles, cf. A. C. Pearson on fr. 996)

¹ As I indicated in *C.R.* 1. p. 54, n. 4.

² But if such was his meaning, why did

he not write ἀγκάλας?—which does not require ἐν; cf. L.S.J.

by Bekker's *Anecdota*, p. 383. 31: 'σημαίνει δὲ τὸ βοηθεῖν'. λαβὼν then, which scribes notoriously tend to confuse with βαλὼν, will here have been confused with a word of almost identical appearance, καλὼν. I take παλαιὸν βρέτας to be governed by ἔζου just as are other accusatives at Eur. *H.F.* 48, *Ion* 366, 1314, 1317, *I.A.* 141-2 (cf. *Or.* 956, *Hel.* 1573), for this construction can equally well signify 'sit at' and (e.g. A. *Agam.* 183, 982-3) 'sit on'; cf. particularly *Agam.* 664 with *Eum.* 446. I reckon that from Παλλάδος βρέτας one can supply Παλλάδα for the object of καλὼν, and to make that clear it may be desirable to place ἀλκαθεῖν καλὼν between commas. However, a process of corruption such as this, involving (as it may) marginal directions or variants, can dislocate word-order, and it is of course possible that we ought to read ἔζου βρέτας παλαιόν, ἀλκαθεῖν καλὼν; but it is not necessary.

Not this sense only, but these two words, are strikingly supported by 258-9 ἀλκὰν ἔχων περὶ βρέτει πλεχθεὶς θεᾶς said of Orestes by the Furies, and 287-9 where he says of himself καλῶ . . . Ἀθηναίαν ἐμοὶ μολεῖν ἀρωγόν. But this verbal support itself receives the strongest possible confirmation from the plot of the play as indicated by line 279 just above. For the 287-9 sentence is introduced by καὶ νῦν (which is rightly translated 'so now'), and thus refers back to ἐν δὲ τῷδε πράγματι φωνεῖν ἐτάχθην πρὸς σοφοῦ διδασκάλου, the 'wise teacher' being, of course, Apollo. It is not I only, it is the dramatist who has emphasized φωνεῖν ἐτάχθην, and especially φωνεῖν, as anybody who will re-read from 276 will see. And his reason is clear. We learn from 445-53 that licence to *speak* at this stage makes all the difference to the suppliant's status, and we are told exactly why. Yet in the existing text no such command is given by Apollo anywhere in the play; and 80 is, in fact, the only place available for it. Did the god, then, omit to express the essence of the matter in choice Aeschylean Greek in order to specify an axiomatic detail in Greek that was grossly ungrammatical? That, in sum, is the issue; and surely there can only be one answer.

I have not, of course, overlooked two facts; but to the above demonstration they make no difference at all. (i) At 259 (see above) there is πλεχθεὶς, but for Apollo, as for his protégé, that can go without saying; at 446 it does. (ii) Eur. *El.* 1255 πρόσπυζον, say the Dioscuri; but there the necessity of speech does not arise.

So now at last it is possible to consider *Agam.* 1-4 without embarrassment from the influence of ἀγκαθεν at *Eum.* 80.

Agam. 1-4
θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων,
φρουρᾶς, ἐτέλας μῆκος, ἣν κοιμώμενος
στέγαις Ἀτρεϊδῶν ἀγκαθεν κυνὸς δίκην,
ἄστρων κάτοιδα κτλ.

Why does the φύλαξ compare himself to a dog?

Presumably (call this sense A) because the dog is the typical domestic watchman, the guard *par excellence*. 'Dog' implies guardian and defender at 607 and 896. More significant still, in my opinion, is Plato's general comparison, *Rep.* 375 c, of his φύλακες to dogs.

But that is not the prevailing view. All but some four editors (see below), following Klausen and Hermann, relate the simile not (except secondarily) to function but to posture (sense B). 'Head on arm'; so Paley, Sidgwick, G. Thomson;¹ 'stretched on elbows', Headlam, cf. Weir Smyth. Their reason for doing

¹ But where is 'head'? Why, in Homer: *Od.* xiv. 494, etc.

so is admittedly compulsion from *Eum.* 80. Verrall, however, attempted nevertheless to elicit sense A from the text as it stands; but this cannot be achieved by his method, because there are two good reasons why *στέγαις ἄγκαθεν* cannot mean 'in the embrace of the roof'.

Wholly apart from *Eum.* 80, sense B, maintained as we have seen by Fraenkel, is very objectionable here, for at least three reasons. (i) Expression: no matter what the sense extracted, a man (or dog) can hardly be described as reclining in (still less from) *his own* arms; not only is there no parallel, it is against all analogy.¹ (ii) 'A man could hardly describe himself as having lain in a certain posture for a year'—Verrall. (iii) Triviality: to my taste at least, this is an insignificant and silly detail to drop, suddenly, into the description of a situation so dramatic.

Sense A is undoubtedly right, but how is it to be got? Schneidewin, the first (in *Philologus*, iii, pp. 116–20) to require this sense, took *ἄγκαθεν* on the authority of the ancient glosses as a by-form of *ἀνέκαθεν*, and altered *στέγαις* to *στέγης*; he was followed by Enger, Dindorf, and Keck. 'Oben auf dem flachen dache des Atridenschlosses gelagert.' About this I have two qualms. (i) Neither *ἀνέκαθεν* nor the far commoner *ἀνωθεν* is found to govern any absolutely certain² genitive in tragedy; and the construction is described as rare (L.S.J.). But that may be accidental; what weighs with me much more is (ii); I cannot quite bring myself to believe that *κοιμώμενος ἀνωθεν* was Greek for 'reclining upon' as spoken by the person who so describes *himself*. This fact differentiates it materially from *ἀνωθεν ἡμένου* at *Suppl.* 597; and even *Cho.* 834, said of persons on whose behalf vengeance is to be exacted, is a far cry from *Agam.* 3. For Schneidewin are cited not those passages but (later, ed. Schneidewin—Hense 1883) *Soph. Ant.* 411; there *ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων* is taken with *καθήμεθα*, but in my opinion this will not explain its context, and in fact the scholastic literature on that passage is a hopeless tangle.³

The solution, I now suggest, lies in appreciating that the closeness of relation established by the internal accusative imparts to *ἦν* (sc. *φρουρῶν*) *κοιμώμενος* the sense of *φρουρῶν* (although not, of course, its construction); *στέγαις* is then sound, a dative of interest; and *ἀνέκαθεν* (see below) means 'from above' precisely as elsewhere in the *Oresteia*, *Cho.* 427, *Eum.* 373. There is, I think, only one complete parallel to this; but it too is Aeschylean, *Suppl.* 381–3 *τὸν ὑψόθεν σκοπὸν . . . φύλακα . . . βροτῶν*. 'On guard for the house of the Atreidae from above' is as specific as simple. *ἀνέκαθεν* does not *jar* with *κυνὸς δίκην*; for dogs on the roof, see Fraenkel. If it be true that *ἄγκαθεν* represents a syncope impossible for the classical period (and I am not convinced, for Hesychius gives a by-form *ἀνακάς*), there is still not the faintest reason why we should not assume here the same corruption as has occurred with certainty at *Eum.* 373; following Franz and Keck we can⁴ read *ἀνέκαθεν*, since the form was not purely lyrical in Greek, and our Watchman indulges in a dactylic third foot at 15.

If the above arguments are sound, *ἄγκαθεν* from *ἀγκάς*, the *δὲ* *λεγόμενον*, the unconstruable, disappears into the limbo of ghost words.

Cambridge

A. Y. CAMPBELL

¹ See, e.g., *Il.* xiv. 213; xxii. 503; *Od.* xi. 261; *Agam.* 723 (with either reading).

² There is a complication at 1579.

³ e.g. Jebb confuses windward and lee-

ward. I hope some day to publish a clarification.

⁴ Hermann, too, admitted that this was a possibility.

DACTYLS IN COMIC TROCHAICS

DESPITE Hephaestion's confident assertion¹: δέχεται δὲ (τὸ τροχαϊκὸν) πόδας ἐν μὲν ταῖς περιτταῖς . . . δάκτυλον, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀρτίαις . . . δάκτυλον, scholars have often doubted the admissibility of dactyls into trochaic verse. Porson, in the preface to his edition of the *Hecuba*, gave this view the lie direct; and modern metricians seem to treat the question as *strittig*. It may be worth while to see what was the usage of Attic comedy in this matter. Again, the authorities vary from affirmation through doubt to flat denial. White² says: 'the dactyl usurps the place of the first or last simple foot in a (trochaic) dimeter which may be part of a tetrameter. . . . Editors have attempted to "emend" these passages, but the dactyl is here merely a manifestation of the variability of the arsis of the simple foot that prevailed in the primitive dimeter.' Starkie³ says: 'very rare, and not above suspicion'. Van Leeuwen⁴ writes: 'dactyli a trochaeis κατὰ στίχον usurpatis sunt alieni . . . apud comicos'. Of the three twentieth-century editions of Aristophanes, those of Van Leeuwen, Hall and Geldart, and Coulon, the first alters most, though not all, of the manuscript readings so as to eliminate the dactyl, the other two make no correction and as a rule sound no note of warning in the apparatus. Six⁵ passages only are in question. I will deal with these seriatim, premising only this much: of all the recitative metres of comedy, trochaic is the strictest; e.g. it rejects not only spondees but also anapaests from all but the even feet. It does not therefore seem likely that it would receive dactyls into the odd ones. Yet five out of the six instances display the dactyl in the first, third, or fifth place.

Ach. 318 ὑπὲρ ἐπιζήνου 'θελήσω : τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχων λέγειν.

So Hall and Geldart, Coulon, and van Leeuwen (who, however, writes 'suspectissimus' in the app. crit.). Such *naïvetés* as Brunck's τὴν δέρην are no good; but the view that κεφαλὴν is here an intrusive gloss seems highly probable, whether the word it glossed was some such dialect form as κεβλήν, or, more likely, the simple demonstrative (accompanied, in delivery, with a gesture) τήνδε. Hence Bergk's admirable τήνδ' ἔχων <οὔτω> λέγειν.

Eq. 319 : νῆ Δία : κάμει τοῦτ' ἔδρασε ταῦτόν, ὥστε κατάγελων

So H. and G., and C. There is manuscript confusion; for V and Γ (and other less important codd.) give καὶ νῆ Δία. Van L. gives Porson's likely transposition: κάμει τοῦτ' . . . ταῦτόν, νῆ Δί', ὥστε . . . (His own suggestion in the app. crit. ναὶ μὰ Δί' ἐμέ : τοῦτ' . . . is bad, as (1) being farther from the text, (2) giving an illegally divided tribrach.)

Vesp. 496 ἦν δὲ γήτειον προσαιτῇ : ταῖς ἀφύαις ἦδυσμά τι

Again kept by H. and G., and C., also by Van L. in his first edition: in the second he accepts and prints Blaydes's ταῖς τριχίσιν ἦ :- (giving a quite legitimate sixth anapaest), supposing ἀφύαις to have been a gloss on the rarer τριχίσιν. (Brunck's τις for ταῖς, mentioned in the app. crit. of H. and G., merely

¹ Ed. Consbruch, p. 269.

² *Verse of Greek Comedy*, § 205.

³ Ed. *Wasps*, p. xlv.

⁴ *Prolegomena*, p. 216.

⁵ In *Av.* 1113 πρηγορεῶνας should be taken as a ditrochee by synizesis.

gives an illegally divided fifth tribrach and deprives us of the necessary article.)

Ar. 396 : δημοσίῃ γὰρ ἵνα ταφῶμεν

So H. and G., and C. Herwerden excised the line as an intrusive gloss. It is certainly unnecessary for the sense; but the loss of γὰρ gives a slightly awkward asyndeton, and Van L.'s view that the word δημοσίῃ only is the intrusive gloss is probably sounder. He suggests, and prints, εὐπρεπῶς.

Thes. 465 δεῖ δὲ ταύτης : τῆς ὕβρεως ἥ-

So H. and G., and C.; but what could be simpler than Van L.'s ὕβρεος (giving a fourth anapaest)? For such forms in Ar. see *Vesp.* 1282, 1458, φύσεος.

Ecl. 1156 τοῖς γελῶσι δ' ἡδέως διὰ : τὸν γέλων κρίνειν ἐμέ.

Not only does this line display a dactyl in the fourth foot but it also lacks the normal fourth diaeresis. This last fact is not of great importance, for a number of Aristophanes' trochaic tetrameters show no fourth diaeresis. Yet the combination of this and the dactyl is suspicious. H. and G., and C. keep the text: Van L. gives Porson's διὰ τὸ γελᾶν (a fifth foot tribrach), countenancing the lack of diaeresis. Is it possible that Ar. wrote something like ἡδέως γε διὰ τοῖς κρίνειν ἐμέ? If τοδί were glossed by τὸν γέλων the γε might well disappear when the gloss entered the text, thus restoring some sort of scansion. (I can find no instance of a dactyl in the not very numerous trochaics contained in the comic fragments.)

When we consider the ease with which all these lines (the last perhaps excepted) can be altered, it is tempting to suppose that they all should be—and that would be the end of the dactyl in comic trochaic verse.

Brasenose College, Oxford

M. PLATNAUER

AEGISTHUS AND THE CHORUS

THE recent publication of Professor Fraenkel's *Agamemnon* prompts me to raise once more the vexed question of ll. 1649–54, with particular reference to Stanley's transposition. This was accepted by Professor George Thomson in his edition, together with certain textual alterations which he and Fraenkel evidently agree to be essential to it. Fraenkel, rightly in my opinion, rejects these textual alterations; and mainly for this reason rejects the transposition. I maintain that the textual points are inessential and that the transposition is absolutely necessary.

Here is the manuscript assignation with Stanley's in brackets :

- AI. [AI.] ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δοκεῖς τάδ' ἔρδειν καὶ λέγειν, γνώσῃ τάχα.
 XO. εἶα δὴ, φίλοι λοχίται, τοῦργον οὐχ ἑκάς τόδε. 1650
 εἶα δὴ, ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπίζεται.
 AI. [XO.] ἀλλὰ κάγω μὴν πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν.
 XO. [AI.] δεχομένοις λέγεις θανεῖν σε· τὴν τύχην δ' αἰρούμεθα.
 KA. [KA.] μηδαμῶς, ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδράν, ἀλλὰ δράσασμεν κακά.

I accept without comment the assignation of 1650 to Aegisthus. I note that Fraenkel approves. The position then is that Aegisthus summons his body-guard to deal with the insubordinate Chorus. The Chorus offer resistance, and the proceedings are observed by Clytemnestra in silence until 1654.

Now the idea that the feeble and aged Chorus (see Thomson ad loc.) are armed with swords is so extraordinary that we are bound to avoid it if possible. Fraenkel appears to sympathize, but regretfully concludes that avoidance is impossible. Our only hope lies in assigning 1652 to the Chorus; and that line is translated by Fraenkel 'Nay, I too am hilt-in-hand, and do not refuse to die'. 'Hilt-in-hand' is the correct literal translation of *πρόκωπος*, which is certainly established against all emendation by *καί* preceding. Fraenkel therefore accepts the arming of the Chorus, and withal rejects the transposition. But I agree with Tucker in referring *πρόκωπος* to the *σκήπτρα*. It cannot apply literally, but surely a metaphor would here be very much in place.

Moreover, this line is much more suited to the Chorus. It is reasonable to suppose that Aegisthus' body-guard was immediately at hand, and whatever defensive measures the Chorus may have been capable of—indeed even if they actually had swords—they would have had difficulty in forcing an encounter if Aegisthus wished temporarily to avoid it. Therefore Aegisthus cannot have thought that his life was at stake, and the tradition can only rest on the assumption that he was speaking ironically. This assumption, however, is ruled out by a glance at his whole part. Aegisthus throughout expresses his grievances, triumphs, and threats with uncompromising directness, and I feel that he cannot have spoken this line. But in the mouth of the Chorus it is very appropriate. The body-guard have been ordered to draw swords and proceed to execution. The Chorus know that their strength is as a child's; but they long for death (1448), and Aegisthus has roused them to fury. They raise their staves—'Here are *our* swords', they say, and prepare to die fighting. Professor Fraenkel describes this notion as 'grotesque, indeed farcical'. What has he to say of Lear and Ophelia mad, or of aged Priam discharging his *telum imbelles sine ictu* against mighty Pyrrhus? Grotesque perhaps, but infinitely pathetic. The Chorus, then, have only their staves to protect them. Like aged Priam, they can arm to die—they cannot arm to kill.

And who says: 'Thou speakest of thy death; we accept the omen, and choose to take what will come to pass'? Taken by itself, the line might admittedly be spoken by the Chorus, as the manuscripts avow. But is it not more in accord with Aegisthus' vulgar humour? The man who, in threatening the Chorus (1629), thought it worth while to observe that their efforts would fare differently from those of Orpheus, would clearly delight in observing that his present threat was reinforced with an omen. And surely it must be the speaker of this line who is then enjoined by Clytemnestra to abstain from working further ills.

I should add here that, in my opinion, Verrall's assignation of 1651 to the *λογαγός* is correct. The repeated *εἰς δῆ* and the impersonal *πᾶς τις* are mechanical, and strongly suggest the transmission of an order by a subordinate executive. The brief intervention is reminiscent of the Porter in the *Choephori*.

In his vol. iii, p. 781, Professor Fraenkel argues against this view. He quotes Hermann as saying that it would be just and natural to seek an omen against the murderer Aegisthus, but absurd (? and unjust) to seek such an omen against the Chorus. Fraenkel himself adds that it would not be worth while to bestir oneself unduly about the frail and aged Chorus; while the death of Aegisthus would be an objective sufficiently difficult and vital to warrant the Chorus's clutching at any stray aid. These arguments are not very strong. They would certainly harmonize with the manuscript assignation, but against the trans-

position they are quite unavailing. Aegisthus summons his men to immediate execution upon the Chorus. Does he concern himself with reason and justice? Does he pause to reflect on their natural expectation of life?

Moreover, it is easy to see how the Stanley-Verrall version, if correct, originally succumbed to distortion. It goes without saying that the Chorus are addressed in the singular, here as elsewhere; and that Aegisthus refers to himself and his retainers in the plural. But to a scribe who thought in terms of Aegisthus *v.* the Chorus this would be a ready source of confusion; while (in the days before 1650 was transferred to the Chorus) the intervention of the *λοχαγός* might become a source of error, if the scribe were writing mechanically.

Accordingly, I recommend that the transposition of Stanley, as improved in respect of 1651 by Verrall, be accepted. Aegisthus summons his men (1650), the *λοχαγός* gives the necessary order (1651); the Chorus brandish their staves, and announce that they are ready to die (1652); Aegisthus delightedly comments on the omen (1653); and finally Clytemnestra decides to intervene.

University College of North Wales, Bangor

A. D. FITTON BROWN

NOTES ON THUCYDIDES

iv. 126. 2 ἀγαθοῖς γὰρ εἶναι ὑμῖν προσήκει τὰ πολέμια οὐ διὰ ξυμμάχων παρουσίαν ἐκάστοτε, ἀλλὰ δι' οἰκείαν ἀρετὴν, καὶ μηδὲν πλῆθος πεφοβήσθαι ἐτέρων, οἳ γε μηδὲ ἀπὸ πολιτειῶν τοιούτων ἦεστε, ἐν αἷς οὐ πολλοὶ ὄλγαν ἔρχουσιν, ἀλλὰ πλεόνων μᾶλλον ἐλάσσους, οὐκ ἄλλω τινὶ κτησόμενοι τὴν δυναστείαν ἢ τῷ μαχόμενοι κρατεῖν (from Brasidas' speech to his troops when they have been deserted by Perdiccas' army, and are facing a force of Lyncestians and Illyrians far superior in numbers to their own).

ALL editors seem to be agreed that the meaning of this sentence is clear enough, but the expression of it so awkward that we must bracket οὐ (before πολλοί) or μηδέ, or regard οὐ as superfluous, or take ἐν αἷς not as explanatory of τοιούτων but as equivalent to ἀλλ' ἐν ὑμῖν, or read ἐν αἷς <δέ>. (Of these, the last suggestion, Herwerden's, is the best.) The general sense, we are told, is that Brasidas is congratulating his men on being Spartans who have won by fighting a privileged position, a *δυναστεία*, over masses of perioikoi and helots; Grote (vol. v, pp. 359-60 of the 1888 edition) went so far as to assert, in his grave liberal way, that Brasidas is here claiming the right of the stronger as the legitimate source of power as plainly as the Athenians did later at Melos. All this manipulation of the text is, I am convinced, wrong, because the meaning, though clear enough, is the opposite of what has been supposed. Brasidas is slightly referring to the large numbers of the enemy, who (he says, in the words ἐν αἷς οὐ πολλοὶ κτλ.) are no better than slaves of a small military clique, now being driven into battle by their rulers: 'you must not be afraid of any number of such men as these'. His troops were not in fact Spartans; and men from Mantinea, Tegea, Phlius, and other Peloponnesian cities, not to mention the Chalcidian and Acanthian levies (the helots in Brasidas' army are altogether forgotten), would not have recognized a description of themselves as citizens of states with military *δυναστεῖαι* at the head, and would not have been complimented by it, if they had: with them the majority, the sound hoplite burghers, did rule. Nor would Sparta itself have been so described by any but an enemy: Demaratus said that Spartans were *free men*, not tyrants,

ἐλεύθεροι γὰρ εἶντες οὐ πάντα ἐλεύθεροί εἰσι· ἔπεστι γὰρ σφι δεσπότης νόμος. So Brasidas himself on a later occasion, v. 9. 1, said to his Peloponnesians, ἀπὸ οἷας χώρας ἤκομεν, ὅτι αἰεὶ διὰ τὸ εὐψυχον ἐλεύθεροι. The word *δυναστεία* means a small ruling clique here as elsewhere in Thucydides, iii. 62. 3, iv. 78. 3, and vi. 38. 3; note especially iii. 62. 3, where it is *νόμοις καὶ τῷ σωφρονεστάτῳ ἐναντιώτατον*, the opposite of all that Sparta, according to Spartans, stood for; and in the passage we are discussing it refers to the small Argead ruling class among the Macedonians and similar chieftainships among the others. οἱ γὰρ therefore is properly said to be causal; ἐν αἷς, on the other hand, is not, but definitive of *τοιούτων* (which is indeed otherwise left quite vague).

The words ἀπὸ πολιτειῶν τοιούτων ἦκετε, and the similar words in v. 9. 1 quoted above, recall those of Pericles, ἀπὸ οἷας τε ἐπιτηδεύσεως ἤλθομεν ἐπ' αὐτὰ καὶ μεθ' οἷας πολιτείας καὶ τρόπων ἐξ οἷων μεγάλα ἐγένετο (ii. 36. 4); and not the words only; for the contrast between the free state and the military *δυναστεία* is (it cannot, it seems, be said too often) typical of the whole Greek world. When any Greek city, Sparta or Athens or Corinth, is compared by a Greek with the *barbaroi*, the Greeks are described as free men, neither a ruling clique or tyrants nor the subjects of such, but of νόμοι agreed to by all.

iv. 128. 5 ἀπὸ τούτου τε (the disorderly behaviour of Brasidas' troops after their retreat from Lyncestis) πρῶτον Περδίκκας Βρασίδαν τε πολέμον ἐνόμισε καὶ ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν Πελοποννησίων τῇ μὲν γνώμῃ δι' Ἀθηναίους οὐ ξύνηθες μίσος εἶχε, τῶν δὲ ἀναγκαίων ξυμφόρων διαναστὰς ἐπρασεν ὅτῃ τρόπῳ τάχιστα τοῖς μὲν ξυμβήσεται, τῶν δὲ ἀπαλλάξεται.

This is translated by editors somewhat as follows: 'as a result of this Perdiccas felt for the first time that Brasidas was an enemy, and he began to have for the Peloponnesians in general a hatred that in his heart was, because of the Athenians, not natural to him (i.e. the presence of the active Athenians in Chalcidice and Thrace made him naturally prepared to be friends with their enemies, but now he felt an unwonted hatred for them); and, departing from his own urgent interests (the undeniable advantages which alliance with the Peloponnesians gave him), he now sought how best to compose his differences with Athens and get quit of Brasidas and his troops'. I agree with Arnold, who seems to be the only editor to have seen the major difficulty in this, that 'one would suppose that the words τῶν δὲ ἀναγκαίων ξυμφόρων διαναστὰς must answer to τῇ μὲν γνώμῃ . . . μίσος εἶχε; which according to the above interpretation they do not, and the particle μέν has nothing to answer to it'. The clause beginning with τῇ μὲν γνώμῃ should express Perdiccas' real feelings or opinions, and be opposed to what he was now compelled (*ἀναγκαίων*) to do, and not be the cause of it; and it is not difficult so to translate it and give the general sense of the whole: 'with regard to the Peloponnesians, while he had in his heart, owing to the activities of Athens, no deepseated hatred for them, he was compelled to forsake his own interests and come to terms with Athens and get rid of them'. It is the mistranslation of οὐ ξύνηθες as 'extraordinary' or 'unnatural', making the μέν-clause in effect positive instead of negative, which has led to the trouble; get rid of that, and we have the proper contrast between the two clauses.

I do not pretend to be able to interpret the remarkable phrase τῶν ἀναγκαίων ξυμφόρων διαναστὰς. I have given above something of the usual rendering, in which, however, I have no confidence. The scholiast's rendering, διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην συμφέρειν νομίσας μισεῖν τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀποστὰς, may give the

general sense, but it is not there in the Greek. διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην seems right; Madvig suggested τῇ ἀναγκαίῳ ξυμφόρῳ; but I cannot help thinking that τῇ ἀναγκαίῳ ξυμφορᾷ, or something like it, may be the true reading: 'owing to the unavoidable clash of events'.

i. 61. 3-4. The Athenians are besieging Pydna (which was on the coast) when they hear of the arrival of Aristeus at Potidaea; they thereupon conclude a makeshift alliance¹ with Perdiccas, and ἀπανίστανται ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας, καὶ ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Βέροιαν κάκειθεν ἐπὶ Στρέψαν καὶ περάσαντες πρῶτον τοῦ χωρίου καὶ οὐχ ἐλόντες ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ γῆν πρὸς τὴν Ποτειδαίαν.

ἐπὶ Στρέψαν Pluygers: ἐπιστρέψαντες codd.

In his generous review of the first volume of my Commentary on Thucydides in *J.H.S.* lxi, Professor Wade-Gery defends the above text (that of most editors, including Stuart Jones), on which I had expressed some doubt, and complains that my note is obscure. Since my doubts remain, but I plead guilty to the obscurity, and, moreover, there was a mistake in my argument, I would like an opportunity to restate them.

First on the meaning of ἀπανίστανται: Wade-Gery says that it can here mean 'relinquish their operations' in Macedonia, without saying anything of the direction in which they moved, just as it can mean 'relinquish the siege' of Potidaea (i. 139. 1) or of Syracuse (vii. 48. 2). But the demand to 'relinquish the siege' of the former and the request not to relinquish the siege of the latter certainly include the physical withdrawal of the besieging troops, in some direction or other; and I cannot see that ἀπ. ἐκ τῆς *M.* can mean anything but '(gave up the siege and) withdrew out of Macedonia'. If that is correct, it is remarkable, to say the least, that the Athenians follow up this withdrawal by a journey farther into Macedonia than they have yet been, namely to Beroea. Secondly, Wade-Gery thinks it quite possible that the Athenians went from Pydna to Strepsa by land, and that if they did, they may well have gone by Beroea, for there may have been the lowest practicable crossing of the Haliacmon (a wide and deep river); but I still maintain that ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ γῆν πρὸς τὴν Π. implies that the previous part of the journey had been by sea; and why should the Athenians have gone at least 120 kilometres by road through recently hostile country, when they could reach the same point by a sea journey one-fifth of the distance in the transports that had brought them from Athens? The journey to Beroea therefore is not only remarkable but apparently pointless.

If I were to read, in a history of a war between Great Britain and Germany, that our forces which had been besieging Bremen by sea and land, on the receipt of bad news from Calais, patched up a peace with the Emperor and withdrew from Germany, and then arrived at Cologne and thence Dunkirk, and, having failed in an attempt to take the latter, had gone by land towards Calais, I should conclude either that 'Cologne' was corrupt or that the mention of the journey thither had got out of place; and I should be strengthened in my belief by the words 'by land towards Calais' which to me would imply that the previous journey from Bremen had been, as we should anyhow expect it to have been, by sea. This analogy is sufficiently close for us to use the same argument here. If ἐς Βέροιαν is corrupt, Herbst's περαιωθέντες for ἐς Βέροιαν καὶ (keeping ἐπὶ Στρέψαν) is ingenious, though I agree not very convincing; another name, e.g. Αἰνεαν, may be preferable (Bergk proposed another name in 1865, *Philol.* xxii. 538, and though his suggestion, Βρέαν, is not possible, he saw

¹ For ἀναγκαίαν see J. Tate, *C.R.* lxii, 1948, pp. 7-8.

the problem clearly); but perhaps the mention of the journey to Beroea is not corrupt, but out of place; if so, Athenian delegates may have gone there in order to make the agreement with Perdikkas. In that case we have a choice of two alterations to the text of our manuscripts, according as we keep or reject *ἐπιστρέφαντες* (it is here that I would correct the mistake in my book, p. 217, end of first paragraph): either *ἔπειτα δὲ ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Βέροϊαν* (καὶ) *ξύμβασιν ποιησάμενοι καὶ ξυμμαχίαν ἀναγκαίαν πρὸς τὸν Περδίκκαν, ὡς αὐτοὺς κατήπειγεν ἡ Ποτείδαα καὶ ὁ Ἀριστεὺς παρεληλυθώς, κακείθεν ἐπιστρέψαντες ἀπανίστανται ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας, καὶ* (ἐπὶ . . . πλέοντες) *καὶ πειράσαντες πρῶτον τοῦ χωρίου κτλ. ὃς ἔπειτα δὲ ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Βέροϊαν* (καὶ) *ξ. π. . . παρεληλυθώς, ἀπανίστανται ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας, [καὶ] κακείθεν ἐπὶ Στρέψαν (πλέοντες) καὶ πειράσαντες, κτλ.*

I am conscious that both of these suggestions are highly elaborate; but since it is possible that *ἀφ. ἐς Β.* is only out of place, they should be mentioned—the significance of the first of the two being this, that *ἐπιστρέφαντες* returns to the text, and, though we still need some name for the town which the Athenians failed to capture, that name need no longer be (though equally well it may be) Strepsa. That is why I am not sure of Pluygers's conjecture; and I am pretty sure that it will not stand by itself. I would agree, however, that the substitution of another name, such as *Αἰνείαν*, for *Βέροϊαν*, and the retention of *ἐπὶ Στρέψαν*, together make a simpler-looking emendation.

University of Glasgow

A. W. GOMME

VARIA IUVENALIANA

(1) Juv. i. 2; iii. 203 and 208; Lucan viii. 715 (Cordus: *v.l.* Codrus).

It is curious how tenaciously Codrus as a Roman name keeps its foothold in Latin texts. Evicted from Juv. i. 2 on the ground of manuscript authority¹ (Cordus PS, Codrus pR (= Par. 8072) Ψ)² and also from Lucan viii. 715 (Cordus Z(M), Codrus Ω), it yet survives in our editions at Juv. iii. 203 and 208, where a Roman name is needed. For iii. 203 PR happen to be defective; except for U, which has *Cordo*, the remaining witnesses offer *Codro*. In 208 U similarly gives *Cordus*; Vind. reads *Cordrus*, but PR and the rest have *Codrus*. The poor littérateur of the third satire cannot be proved to be the same person as the author of a *Theseid* in i. 2, but there is nothing impossible in the identification. Be this as it may, external evidence points unanimously to the form *Cordus* in all passages under discussion. Not only have we Quintilian's statement (i. 4. 25) that *Cordus* was a Latin name *ex casu nascentium*, like Agrippa, Opiter, or Postumus, but elsewhere in literature the name is given as *Cordus* with no significant variant that I can discover.³ Further, a Q. Marius *Cordus* appears on coins of the early years of Nero, while all twenty-three

¹ I use Housman's text and sigla, except where stated.

² Servius' citations offer both forms.

³ The principal references are: (a) Caesius Cordus, Tac. *Ann.* iii. 38 and 70 (cf. *C.I.L.* vi. 13971); (b) A. Cremutius Cordus, Tac. *Ann.* iv. 34: cf. Dio lvii. 24, etc.; (c) Q. Iulius

Cordus, Tac. *Hist.* i. 76: he appears as *Kórdos* in a Cyprus inscription, Cagnat, iii. 978; (d) the *alpha paenulatorum* of Mart. ii. 57: cf. iii. 15, iii. 83 (a *v.l.* *Cordex* of no moment), v. 23, v. 26; (e) a cognomen of Mucius Scaevola: here the manuscripts of Dion. Hal. *Ant.* v. 25. 4 give *Kórdos*, wrongly.

tituli cited in the Thesaurus article show Cordus.¹ To these may be added the Brittius Cordus of *C.I.L.* ix. 6320 (= Dessau, *I.L.S.* 7330); this has somehow escaped the compilers.

The certain examples of the name Codrus in Latin literature can be explained. In Virgil's *Eclogues* (v. 11; vii. 22 and 26) it has been thought, not without reason in view of its Greek flavour, to be a pseudonym of a poet of the *neoteric*,² for elsewhere it is confined to the last mythical king of Attica, apart from Val. Flacc. ii. 136, where it is the name of an obscure Lemnian. In inscriptions it is only found in *C.I.L.* vi. 24572 (probably of a slave or *libertus*), and similarly in an inscription in *Not. d. Scavi*, 1909, p. 458.

How therefore can one decently refuse in this matter to U in iii. 203 and 208 the credence editors so willingly accord to P in i. 2? If it is asked why there is fluctuation in the Juvenal and Lucan traditions and nowhere else, there seem to be, for Juvenal at least, two possible answers: either at an early stage in the transmission an intrusive *r* worked its way in,³ as we see in *Vind.* in iii. 208, and then the wrong *r* was deleted by a corrector,⁴ or in i. 2 the proximity of the Greek names Theseis, Telephus, and Orestes facilitated the interpolation. These two causes may have been at work together: once one passage had been corrupted, the other would be readily accommodated to it, on the supposition that the same person was in question.

Housman's citation of Lucan viii. 767 in his note on Lucan viii. 715 suggests that he had come to this view of the name by 1926, but he did not make any change in the second edition of his Juvenal five years later.

(2) Juv. iii. 109–111

praeterea sanctum nihil — abi nguine tutum,
non matrona laris, non filia virgo, neque ipse
sponsus levis adhuc, non filius ante pudicus.

109 *sic PR*: est neque *suprascr. p*: auct ab *Vind.*: aut ab *GK* (= *Laur. xxxiv.*
42) *LO*: atque ab *U*: est ab *A*: est vel ab *T* (vel in *ras.*): est et ab *Ψ*
(adopted later by Owen, *J.Phil.* xxxiii, p. 242) 110 neque *PΨ*: nec *U Vind.*
I have long suspected that the length of Housman's note on line 109 concealed some uneasiness about his own supplement *aut <tibi> ab*. His defence of the pronoun's delayed position is sound enough, and the loss of the word can be accounted for diplomatically even without the parallel from Plaut. *Trin.* 798. Yet his citations otherwise do nothing to allay the misgivings one feels about the intrusion of *tibi* here: consider them *seriatim*. The verbs in the lines preceding these in the second person singular (*rides, poscas, dixeris* iii. 100–3) give no support, for the paratactic construction ends at line 103 and need not, indeed cannot, be resuscitated here. *tibi* in iii. 109 is immediately picked up by *tu nescis* in the next line, and it is upon the coupling of these two pronouns that the effect of that passage depends. xiii. 178 is no better, for *tibi* there is embedded in a vivid passage of dialogue and the imperative *crede* has preceded in line 175. His additional citation (p. xlv) of Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 32 is no help; *vobis* there occurs in a sentence containing several verbs in the second person plural and so proves nothing.

¹ So, e.g., Q. Manilius Cordus in *C.I.L.* xi. 707 (= *I.L.S.* 2705) and M. Granius Cordus in ix. 2353 (= *I.L.S.* 6513). The spelling Gordus in xiii. 1833 is not for our purpose significant.

² As by Skutsch in *R.E.* Suppl. i, col. 324.

³ Cf. Juv. vii. 154 (crambre P Arou).

⁴ This has happened in P in Juv. i. 2; see Beer, *Spicilegium*, p. 22 and facsimile.

The variations in the interpolated manuscripts indicate no more than a piece of clumsy patchwork arising from the insertion of *aut*, *et*, *vel*, or *neque*, with the probable displacement of a verb to make room, in order to join together two elements in a sentence that originally were not joined at all. Endings of lines are especially vulnerable to corruption in the Juvenal tradition,¹ and it is here that the fault has been lurking all the while, the errors in the fourth foot being consequential, not primary. The last word of line 109 was, I believe, not *tutum* but *tuta*, with a strong pause before it, as in line 114 below, and the passage should be restored thus:

praeterea sanctum nihil exstat ab inguine; tuta
non matrona laris, non filia virgo . . .

The magnificent sweep of the rhetoric which results needs no comment: a flabby sentence becomes the equal of some of Juvenal at his best.

The textual degeneration may be easily demonstrated. First *tuta* was misread as *tutu*² and this *vox nihili* was taken to be *tutum* written in suspension, the cross-stroke of the second *t* perhaps helping the illusion. With the simultaneous or perhaps consequential loss of the stop before this word, the two neuter adjectives in the verse had somehow to be coupled together, and this was most simply done by resolving *exstat* into *est aut*. The metre once violated, interpolation set in in earnest, as we see from *est et ab* of Ψ or the correction *est vel ab* of T, both of which expedients scan. A squeamish emender administered the final touch: needlessly perturbed by the use of the positive conjunction *aut* or *et* with the preceding negative *nihil*,³ he gave us what we find in p, *est neque*. This is also metrical, and editors have tended to accept this piece of pinchbeck latinity.⁴

It is noteworthy that the sounder witnesses to the text show to some advantage here; P and its congener R make no effort to join the two adjectives, while U, representative of a not unreliable tradition, preserves what may be a faint reflection of the truth with its *atque*; were the last three letters of this word the remains of a 'quaere' imported from the margin of its exemplar?

Anyone who thinks that this reconstruction requires too many hypotheses might well ponder Housman's observations on viii. 148 (p. xxx of his edition).

(3) Juv. vii. 13-16

hoc satius quam si dicas sub iudice 'vidi'
quod non vidisti, faciant equites Asiani
†quamquam et Cappadoces faciant equitesque Bithyni 15
altera quos nudo traducit gallica talo.

15 *varie tentatus* 16 gallica PSGU¹: gallia pU² Ψ .

Line 15 as it stands is unsatisfactory and editors obelize it or excise it altogether. It is, however, not so easily eliminated. As regards the quantity of the first syllable of *Bithyni*, F. Marx in 1922 showed, convincingly, I think, that in

¹ Cf. (for *Sat.* i only) in P 35, 70, 126, 159; in Ψ 52, 86, 106, etc.

² For the confusion of *a* and *u* in early minuscule (or half-uncial for that matter) see, e.g., W. M. Lindsay, *Latin Textual Emendation*, p. 83.

³ He had some excuse in that this idiom is abnormal in prose but legitimate in verse; Virg. *Aen.* iv. 339, etc.

⁴ According to U. Knoche, *Gnomon*, ix. 249, *neque* here is suspect anyway, for Juv. seems to have written *nec* except in the phrase *neque enim*. One may well ask why this should have been so, but assuming that this is correct, it might be well to write *nec* in 110 (on the authority of U Vind.) as Bücheler did in his edition of 1886.

a number of instances, especially proper names, both bacchiac and molossic scansion coexisted.¹ The examples which he investigated most closely included Cyrene,² Orion, Hymettus, Diana, Διώνη, and Ἀπόλλων. Although, therefore, everywhere else in Latin poetry the initial syllable of *Bithyni* is long, the possibility of its having been short here cannot be ruled out and there is no justification for hammering the line into the shape of a σπονδαίζων.

If line 15 goes, then the last words of the preceding line are, as Munro observed,³ abrupt and harsh; the construction would have to be a form of 'rhetorical command', as Roby (*Latin Grammar*, § 1620) terms the idiom.⁴ To this there are objections: first, the alleged interpolator provided in line 15 not *quamvis* (which would have been natural to him) but *quamquam* to go with the subjunctive, in conformity to Juvenal's usage, and secondly, he must have known his author much better than the rest of his kind, for in his word-order he closely follows vi. 198-9, where *quamquam* is held up till late in its clause and placed first word in the line, exactly as here: '... dicas haec mollius Haemo | quamquam et Carpophoro . . .'. It is noticeable how in authors in most languages similar mannerisms of expression recur, often within a comparatively short compass, and then, as if evicted from the writer's consciousness, are not found again.⁵ So though no one would claim that line 15 bore that elusive thing the 'signature of Juvenal' (to use Owen's unhappy phrase), it has something authentic about it.

What then is to be made of line 16? Although *gallica* has the stronger manuscript support, it is open to three objections:

- (a) If the reference is to the exhibition of slaves on the *catasta*, then why *altera*, with its implication that one ankle only was bared and chalked? That this was not, in point of fact, the procedure we see from Tibullus ii. 3. 59-60: '... quem saepe coegit | barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes'. The singular *gypsatum* . . . *pedem*, had custom demanded it, could have been written here.
- (b) As *gallicula* occurs in the scholiasts' explanation of *trechedipna* in iii. 67, it may be surmised that some form of this word would spring to the mind of a puzzled annotator here in view of the proximity of *nudo* . . . *talo*.
- (c) The exhibition on the *catasta* is too 'temporary' an event to form a satisfactory periphrastic description here (so Friedländer).

In consequence editors have accepted *altera* . . . *Gallia*, understanding New Gaul or Galatia. Even so, one cannot feel happy about the collocation of proper names here, however one punctuates the passage. Munro, indeed, put a semicolon after *Cappadoces* in line 15; this might overcome any difficulty he may have felt about the mention of Galatia as a source of Cappadocian or Bithynian slaves, yet one sympathizes with him in his rather desperate concluding observation 'Bithynia and Galatia had got very much mixed up together'.

¹ 'Molossische und baccheische Wortformen', in *Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie*, phil.-hist. Klasse xxxvii. 1, especially p. 133.

² The references for Cyrene are: (a) long first syllable, *Ar. Thesm.* 98, *Apoll. Rhod.* ii. 500, *Callim.* iii. 206; (b) short, *Hes. fr.* 128 Rz., *Pindar* (8 times), *Callim.* ii. 73 and 94. In Latin it is long four times in *Virg. Georg.*

iv, but short in *Cat.* 7. 4 and *Catalepton* 9. 61.

³ Quoted by Mayor ad loc. (p. 276).

⁴ His examples mostly show the perfect subjunctive, but *Cic. Off.* iii. 54 is a safe instance of the present (*vendat aedes* = *fac eum vendere*).

⁵ See, e.g. for Plautus, F. W. Hall in *C.Q.* xx. 20 ff.

I suggest that a simple solution has been overlooked, based on Claudian, *In Eutropium*, i. 59. This poem begins with a wearisome account of this unpleasant specimen's youth, hawked about the Levant as a slave (*per Assyriae trahitur commercia ripae*) and goes on:

hinc fora venalis Galata ductore frequentat
permutatque domos varias.

Here I conceive that Claudian has unwittingly lifted a corner of the veil that elsewhere shrouds in decent obscurity the economy of the slave-trade under the Empire. For we know that when the Galatians finally settled in Asia Minor they kept their distinctive national characteristics: Jerome says that they spoke a Celtic language in his day. Their well-known toughness and lack of contact with the neighbouring peoples would render them eminently suitable as escorts for the convoys of slaves from Asia Minor to the markets of Delos or Italy.¹ It seems to me that it is precisely this function that the words of both Claudian and Juvenal are designed to underline; *Galata ductore* is plain enough, and while *traducere* elsewhere in Juvenal is used metaphorically,² here it has its literal meaning, as e.g. in Plaut. *Cas.* 579, 597, etc.

Claudian is of course a late witness, but if this is on the right lines, then line 16 presents no difficulty and attempts at emendation (such as Weise's <et> at the end of the preceding line) call for no discussion.

Jesus College, Oxford

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

THE FUNCTION OF TENSE VARIATION IN THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD OF ORATIO OBLIQUA

THE secondary tenses of the subjunctive, regularly used by Cicero in oratio obliqua after a past introductory verb, have the inherent disadvantage that two tenses (or three, with the periphrastic future) must be stretched to include the range of meaning covered by seven tenses and three moods of oratio recta. This limitation was by no means regarded as absolute by Cicero's contemporaries and successors; and the historians show a tendency to use primary tenses, after a past or historic present main verb, to retain some of the original values of tense or mood which would become obscured under the Ciceronian convention. No clearly established alternative convention emerges; but consideration of the practice of the historians suggests that variations of tense, used experimentally but with some precision by Caesar and Sallust, were employed by Livy mainly for the purpose of rescuing submerged tense values and by Tacitus largely, but less rigidly, to retain distinctions of mood.

After a primary introductory verb the four tenses of the subjunctive are admitted by all writers, at least to the extent of retaining in oratio obliqua the tenses of the subjunctive used in oratio recta. But the limitations of secondary sequence, as regularly but not invariably observed by Cicero, were more

¹ So in a later age, I am told, the Arab slave-traders used non-Bantu Africans for escorting droves of Bantu to the embarkation points, no doubt because of their lack of

sympathy with their charges.

² e.g. viii. 17 and xi. 31. In ii. 159 the word may, if Friedländer is right, be nearer the literal meaning.

cramping and precluded distinctions of either tense or mood; and it is here that the practice of other prose writers shows an interesting diversity.

Caesar varies between straightforward reporting, with secondary tenses of the subjunctive, and *repraesentatio*, with its wider range of tense. His variations¹ within passages of secondary or primary sequence are mainly in accordance with widely accepted principles, i.e. that a present subjunctive naturally serves to represent a general truth or a condition still obtaining at the time of writing, though the surrounding subjunctives may be secondary; or that an imperfect subjunctive must be used in direct dependence on a past verb even in a passage of *repraesentatio*. In other passages Caesar seems to be experimentally flouting the Ciceronian convention, with the object of keeping in reported speech some of the flexibility of the original. The distinction which he aims at preserving is commonly one of tense: i.e. a present and imperfect subjunctive may be used side by side to mark the difference of time between a future and a present indicative of *oratio recta* (e.g. *B.G.* i. 40. 14); or a perfect subjunctive may emphasize the sense of completed, in contrast with past, action (e.g. iv. 8. 2). But in addition to the retention of time values there are signs that he is aiming also at distinguishing a basic from a formal subjunctive, i.e. a subjunctive proper to *oratio recta* from the conventional subjunctive of a subordinate clause of reported speech. In at least one passage of the *Bellum Gallicum*, the present subjunctive of *oratio recta* is retained in *oratio obliqua* to prevent confusion with the formal subjunctive of *oratio obliqua* which is in regular secondary sequence.² Here, then, are the beginnings of a more accurate form of expression, though we may say that Caesar is feeling his way rather than consistently adhering to a fresh formula.

In Sallust's *Catiline* the principle of secondary sequence is, with few exceptions, applied as strictly as by Cicero, the infrequent variations appearing only in dependence on a verb in an historic present. Sallust seems to be making occasional and hesitating use of the possibilities indicated by Caesar. In *Cat.* 32. 2 ('mandat quibus rebus possent opes factionis confirmari . . . maturent . . . parent') and 34. 1 ('respondit si quid . . . uellent, ab armis discedant'), the imperfect subjunctives, as with Caesar, represent an indicative of *oratio recta*, in contrast with the imperatival present subjunctives; and in one instance, 34. 2 'nequiverit' (accompanied by imperfect subjunctives), may well represent a true perfect indicative of *oratio recta*. No fresh ground is broken by Sallust, but the seed sown by Caesar is at least kept watered.

Livy's use of the present and perfect subjunctives in secondary sequence is almost entirely directed to retaining in *oratio obliqua* the actual tenses, where possible, of direct speech,³ giving the subjunctives the same time values as the corresponding indicatives; and this he clearly regards as more important than any distinction of mood. A present indicative is regularly represented in *oratio obliqua* by a present subjunctive, a perfect indicative by a perfect subjunctive, so that, for example, simultaneous action (pres. subj.) can be differentiated from continuous past action (imperf. subj.) and completed (perf. subj.) from anterior (pluperf. subj.). On the other hand, a present subjunctive in *oratio obliqua* has to do duty not only for the present indicative of *oratio recta* but

¹ See 'Caesar's use of tense sequence in indirect speech', *C.R.* li. 4.

² Envoys were sent 'qui dicerent sibi esse in animo . . . iter per prouinciam facere,

propterea quod aliud iter haberent nullum: rogare ut eius uoluntate id sibi facere liceat'.

³ See Conway's Appendix II to his edition of Livy ii.

also for a dependent request, a final, consecutive, concessive, etc., subjunctive, and, in clarifying his tenses, he misses the distinction between basic and formal subjunctives that had been adumbrated by Caesar.

In a writer with such an inordinate passion for variety as Tacitus, it is harder to detect underlying principles. He is sometimes content, for short passages, to follow Cicero and to keep within the limits of strict primary or secondary sequence: e.g. Piso's speech, in *A. ii.* 76. 2-4, is reported in secondary subjunctives, that of Domitius Celer in the following chapter in primary. He follows the normal practice of using an imperfect imperatival subjunctive, in direct dependence on a past, or historic present, introductory verb.¹ He constantly adopts Livy's use of a present or perfect tense of the subjunctive to represent the corresponding tense of the indicative (but not of the subjunctive) of direct speech. But in other ways his use of the tenses of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses of oratio obliqua differs from that of other historians; and I believe the clue to these specifically Tacitean usages to lie in his greater concern for the mood than for the tense of the oratio recta.

The form taken in indirect speech by a present subjunctive of direct speech points to a greater feeling in Tacitus than in his predecessors for the syntactical architecture of the sentence concerned. A present subjunctive in a subordinate clause of oratio recta is normally retained unchanged in oratio obliqua by Livy, who keeps close to the original wording at the expense of the real force of the mood, which is overlaid and obscured by the conventional subjunctive of reported speech. Thus in a sentence of the type:

flexos ad modestiam si uidebo, scribam patri ut legionum preces excipiat,

Cicero might be expected to write:

flexos . . . si uideret, se scripturum patri ut . . . exciperet,

with the consequent blurring of both mood and tense. With Livy, this would become:

flexos . . . si uideret (uideat?), scripturum ut . . . excipiat,

with the retention of the present tense of *excipiat* but a change, in default of a parallel form of the subjunctive, from future indicative to imperfect subjunctive (the form preferred by Livy, though he also uses the present subjunctive for this purpose). Tacitus, on the other hand, commonly adopts the formula:

flexos . . . si uideat, scripturum ut . . . exciperet.

The jussive subjunctive follows the regular procedure of an indirect command in dependence on a past verb and is adjusted to secondary sequence; the indicative passes, as usual in Tacitus, into a present subjunctive. Caesar's occasional experimental differentiation between the moods of oratio recta is developed (though with a reversal of tenses: Caesar tends to distinguish the original subjunctive mood by retaining, not adjusting, the present tense, as in the passage quoted above); and, though the use of an imperfect, for an original present, subjunctive cannot be said to be an invariable practice of Tacitus, it is preferred where a distinction is to be marked between two moods which differ in direct speech. Of such passages noted in the first two books of the

¹ e.g. *coleret . . . pauescerent* i. 59. 6, 7; *exclamat irent* ii. 17. 2, etc.

Annal
the se
usual
tense;
custor
presen
i. 46.
No
use of
pursui
tion of
ing th
instea
whole
adduc

i. 26.
uedillo
dence)
quotien
i. 73.
uertere
ludis, q
feri, qu
iurandu
curae.
ii. 12
incipian
diti int
possibil
ii. 15
tolerare
uolneri
obician
reret, n
indicati

The
instan

iii. 3.
gentes i
parente
iii. 4.
poneret
iv. 17

i. 2.
supplic
catus le
ii. 14
cupiant
ultra, n
sisterent
ii. 78
palefieri
tenuerit
Cf. i. 1
4508.

Annals, four clearly illustrate the principle here suggested:¹ in two chapters of the second book (36. 3-5 and 77. 2-5) primary sequence is maintained and the usual distinction between types of subjunctive is not marked by a difference of tense; and in two other passages the tense distinction is the reverse of the customary one—possibly because the subjunctive is contrasted not with a present indicative but with a future perfect indicative (converted to *uidissent* i. 46. 2) and a future simple (converted to *obsideretur* i. 70. 2) respectively.

No claim is made that Tacitus is either consistent or wholly rational in his use of tenses of the subjunctive: such consistency would be inconsistent with his pursuit of variety and his habitual eclecticism. But if the principle of preservation of mood, rather than tense, is admitted as an important factor in determining the sequence in oratio obliqua, many passages in Tacitus disclose a logical, instead of an arbitrary, use of tense. In addition to those already quoted, in whole or in part (i. 17, i. 19. 3, i. 29. 1, i. 46, ii. 14), the following may be adduced in illustration of the same sensitive and precise mode of expression:

i. 26. 2-6: [orditur] . . . ut denarius diurnum stipendium foret (= sit), ne veterani sub vexillo haberentur (= habeantur) . . . [turbatur] cur uenisset (= uenisti, in direct dependence) ? . . . nouum id plane quod . . . reiciat (= reicit). eundem ergo senatum consulendum, quotiens supplicia . . . indicantur (= indicuntur).

i. 73. 3-5: [scripsit] . . . non ideo decretum patri suo caelum, ut in perniciem ciuium is honor uerteretur (past final clause). Cassium histrionem solitum inter alios eiusdem artis interesse ludis, quos mater sua in memoriam Augusti sacrasset (= sacrauerat); nec contra religiones fieri, quod effigies eius . . . uenditionibus hortorum et domuum accedant (= accedunt). ius iurandum perinde aestimandum quam si Iouem fefellisset (= -isset); deorum iniurias dis curae.

ii. 12. 4-5: [secum agitabat] . . . si contio uocetur (= uocatur), illic quoque quae pauci incipiant (= incipiunt) reliquos adstrepere. penitus noscendas mentes, cum secreti et incustoditi inter militaris cibos spem aut metum proferrent (= proferant, though proferent is a possibility).

ii. 15. 2, 3: [nec omittebant] . . . [nec] quisque testari hos esse Romanos . . . qui, ne bellum tolerarent (past final clause), seditionem induerint (= induerunt); quorum pars onusta uulneribus terga, pars fluctibus et procellis fractos artus infensis rursum hostibus, aduersis dis obiciant (= obiciunt). classem quippe et auia Oceani quaesita, ne quis uenientibus occurreret, ne pulsos premeret (past final clauses): sed ubi miscuerint (= miscuerint, future perfect indicative) manus, inane uictis uentorum remorumue subsidium.

The same tendency is noticeable in other books of the *Annals*. Supporting instances occur in Books III and IV, e.g.:

iii. 34. 13: se quoque in Illyricum profectum et, si ita conducat (= conducat), alias ad gentes iturum, haud semper aequo animo, si ab uxore carissima et tot communium liberorum parente diuelleretur (= diuellar, present subjunctive).

iii. 47. 3: nunc quia non metu ducatur (= ducor), iturum, ut praesentia spectaret componeretque (= spectem componamque).

iv. 17. 4: instabat quippe Seianus incusabatque diductam ciuitatem ut ciuili bello; esse qui

¹ i. 29. 1 'flexos ad modestiam si uideat, si supplices audiat, scripturum patri ut placatus legionum preces exciperet'.

ii. 14. 6 'si taedio uiarum ac maris finem cupiant, hac acie parari: . . . neque bellum ultra, modo se . . . isdem in terris uictorem sisterent'.

ii. 78. 1 'se pulsum, ut locus rebus nouis patefieret, curam exercitus eadem fide qua tenuerit repetisse'.

Cf. i. 17, where *interrogabat* is followed by

cur oboedirent, in direct dependence; by *adirent* (future indicative, differentiated from the tenses that follow); and by three present or perfect subjunctives, representing their corresponding indicatives. This sequence is then broken by 'nec aliud leuamentum quam si certis sub legibus militia *iniretur*, ut singulos denarios *mererent*', etc., for the original 'ineatur . . . mereamus', with the original mood marked by the change to the imperfect tense.

se partium Agrippinae uocent (= uocant) ac, ni resistatur (= resistetur), fore plures; neque aliud gliscntis discordiae remedium quam si unus alterue maxime prompti subuerterentur (= -uertantur).¹

The mixture of tenses would have startled Cicero; but it is hard to see how the original wording could have been conveyed more precisely within the limitations of oratio obliqua.

Bedford College, London

M. ANDREWES

HERODOTUS vi. 74

Κλεομένης . . . δείμα ἔλαβε Σπαρτιητέων και ὑπέεσχε ἐς Θεσσαλίην.

THERE are two main problems about this passage. The first is; why should Cleomenes want to go to Thessaly? If his plan was to return to Sparta with the help of the Arcadians, why did he not go to Arcadia first? This, of course, is not an insuperable difficulty, since we do not know much about the history of Thessaly just at this time, but it is a difficulty none the less.

The second problem is; if Cleomenes did go to Thessaly, why did Herodotus say so in that way? If Cleomenes had really gone such a long way from the Peloponnese and then come back to it, we should expect something like this; 'Cleomenes went to'—where? Elis? Gytheum?—'and then to Thessaly, but after a while he came back to the Peloponnese, and landed at'—where?—'and wandered about Arcadia'. But that is not what he says.

Is it not likely that what Herodotus really wrote was ὑπέεσχε ἐς Σελλασίην? The sentence then becomes natural; he went first to the frontier city of Laconia, thence to Arcadia. The behaviour of Cleomenes also becomes natural; first he went as far as the border, to wait there and see if the party struggle in Sparta would turn against him; then, as it did, he went into Arcadia to procure his return with the help of the Arcadians.

One possible objection to this conjecture is that Herodotus does not usually mention small towns without naming the territory in which they stood, as he does in vii. 168, for Pylus and Taenarum, and viii. 73, for Cardamyle. On the other hand, he does not add any explanation for Aphidnae and Decclea in ix. 73, and Sellasia was probably a fairly well-known place to a Greek reader, since it is mentioned without any explanation by Xenophon in *Hell.* ii. 2. 19.

¹ This instance is admittedly not beyond dispute; *uocent* and *subuerterentur* are possible

The corruption to Θεσσαλίην may have occurred because that word occurs in chapter 72 shortly before.

Oxford

DAPHNE HERWARD

LIBANIUS, OR. xxviii. 20

βέλτιον μὴδὲ ἔχειν ἐρωτᾶν μὴδένα μήτε τῆς μήτε ἐν Γαλάταις πόθεν δέ ταῦτα;

THE reference is to Icarus, Comes Orientis, in 384. Foerster's suspicions of the manuscript reading ('Γαλάταις suspectum. Num Γαδάροις?') are without foundation. There is no manuscript warrant for the change, and Icarus had, as far as is known, no closer connexion with Gadara than that it fell under his jurisdiction as Comes Orientis.

The manuscript reading receives further confirmation from an outside source. The father of Icarus is the Theodorus of Amm. Marc. xxix. 1. 8, where his Gallic origin is mentioned, 'antiquitus claro genere in Gallis natus'.

Hence Lib.'s point is that Icarus at the end of his period of office should be able to face any critic of his governorship, whether in Antioch (τῇδε), his official residence, or in his own country of origin, Gaul.

A. F. NORMAN

University College, Hull

TWO NOTES ON NAEVIUS

(1) THE discussion of Naevius, *trag.* 16 R by Sc. Mariotti, *Stud. Urbinati*, xxiv (1950), p. 176, calls to mind an emendation which I jotted down a long time ago: Nonius, p. 370 M 'Naevius Iphigenia: passo velo (vel hoc codd., corr. Junius) vicinum aquilone hortum fer foras'. Most editors hold that the

forms in oratio recta, but would not account for the tense-variation in oratio obliqua.

correct
Lindsay
perceiv
fer foras
become
mnc. I
protecte
read in
passo, po
Stich. 3
passo p
... qu
The or
Iphig. T
rion Aya
support
Mariotti
does no
ponder
(2) C
Naevius
curr in
colligor

Aesch
FRAEN
850.

An ed
one of
of the
advers
the kn
contro
which
quotat
has suc
and va
the stu
Herm
is expr
his con
is not
examin
storeh
Greek
related

correct reading is *Aquila* and in *portum*. Lindsay, however, puts an obelus, and Havet, perceiving that in *portum* is incompatible with *for foras*, suggests *e portu. vicinum*, which thus becomes untenable, he replaces by *hinc i nunc*. I should rather retain *vicinum*, which is protected by the alliteration with *velo*, and read in *portum perferas*. Note the alliteration of *passo, portum*, and *perferas*, and compare Plaut. *Sich.* 369 'in portum vento secundo, velo passo pervenit'; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 119 'portum . . . quo utinam velis passis perveni liceat'. The original in all probability is Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 1487 f. *ἴτ', ὦ νῆα, ναυαλόεσθε τὸν ἡγαμέμνονος παῖδ' εἰς Ἀθήνας*. This would support Havet's *Aquila* (<*Orestem*). But Mariotti's objection, viz. that *vicinum portum* does not suggest Athens, deserves to be pondered.

(2) Charis. p. 269 Barw. 'nimio pro nimis. Naevius in Agitoria: nimio arte colligor. cur re inquaesita colligor?' (*colligōbcurre inq̄sita colligor* cod., corr. Bothe). The hiatus in the

apparent trochaic septenarius is awkward, and the repetition of *colligor* unbearable. The hiatus could be abolished, and the repetition somewhat eased, by adding *autem* after *cur* (oct. iamb.). Yet I should prefer a senarius:

'nimio arte cōl[lig]ōr: cur re inquaesita colligor?'

The first sentence makes a playfully vague proposition, which is explained in the question. 'I am being kept too tight: why am I tied up before the matter is investigated?' The adverb *arte* is chosen in anticipation of the explanatory *colligor*, the verb *color*, in the sense of *habeor* (Plaut. *Asin.* 708 'illum mater arte contentequae habet'), for the sake of the figure *color-colligor*. The phrase *arte colere* reappears, again in a sort of zeugma, in Sall. *Iug.* 85. 34 'neque illos (milites) arte colam, me opulenter'.

O. SKUTSCH

University College, London

REVIEWS

FRAENKEL'S *AGAMEMNON*

Aeschylus: *Agamemnon*. Edited with a commentary by EDUARD FRAENKEL. 3 vols. Vol. I, pp. xvi+195; Vols. II and III, pp. viii+850. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. Cloth, £4. 4s. net.

AN edition, on an unprecedented scale, of the greatest of Greek tragedies by one of the most distinguished of living scholars is an important event. The scale of the commentary, which runs to over 800 pages, has indeed evoked some adverse criticism. And yet, if Fraenkel occasionally labours the obvious or raps the knuckles of his predecessors, in general his notes are models of exposition or controversy. There are two reasons, apart from the complexity of the problems, which account for the length. Much space is devoted to expounding, often with quotation, the views of earlier scholars. Since the criticism of the *Agamemnon* has such a long and rich history, a summing-up of this kind is both appropriate and valuable. Nor is there a serious danger that these summaries will displace the study of the originals: the edition is likely to send more students back to Hermann and H. L. Ahrens (to mention scholars for whom warm admiration is expressed) than it deters from reading them. Secondly, Fraenkel includes in his commentary a mass of lexicographical and other material whose relevance is not confined to the problems he is discussing; and he is led into detailed examination of passages in other works and authors. The edition is thus a storehouse of information about Greek linguistic usage and of comment upon Greek literature, especially tragic poetry; and those who are working in any related field will be well advised to consult the excellent indexes. I for one

would rather find this information and comment here than hunt for them in some periodical or future volume of *Kleine Schriften*. But it follows that, whatever may be said in the Preface, this is essentially an edition for professional scholars. Let us hope therefore that Fraenkel himself or some authorized *προφήτης* will now prepare an *editio minor*.

There is space here to say little about the text, if the commentary is to be treated as its importance deserves. It is a very cautious text. For this, again, there are two reasons. Obeli or asterisks are freely employed (in more than forty places, as compared with nine in Mazon and seven in Murray); readings are seldom (as in 547 and 1664) printed *exempli gratia*. Secondly, Fraenkel lays down in his Preface a principle which is sound in itself, though scholars would differ as to where it should be applied: namely, that our ignorance is so extensive that, because *we* do not understand the content or form of a text, it need not necessarily be assumed corrupt. Examples of readings retained on this principle are (presumably): *ὑπατοι λεχέων* (51);¹ *ἀέπτοις* (141); *ξύεννος* (1116);² *ἰστορίβης* (1443);³ *ἀπανθίσαι* (1662). Fraenkel's own contributions to the printed text are to be found in 57 (lacuna after *τῶν δὲ μετοίκων*), 1652 (*κοῦκ*), and 1673; in 1389 his *ῥαγὴν* finds its way into the apparatus criticus and is very plausible. Most of the emendations accepted are of long standing. At 242 *τῶς* is adopted from Maas. Wilamowitz is followed a dozen times, and Headlam half a dozen, including his brilliant *ἐπεγχύδαν* at 1137. Fraenkel's attitude towards the evidence of glossaries is sceptical, but *σμοιῶ* (639) and *χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα* (677) are mentioned with favour, though not printed.

In the commentary Fraenkel shows himself formidably equipped for a formidable task. To a many-sided linguistic scholarship he adds acuteness of judgement and a genuine, if not infallible, sense of poetry and drama. This last gift is well displayed in some of the general interpretative notes, e.g. on the Watchman's speech (p. 25), on the Parodos (pp. 146 f.), on the Cassandra scene (pp. 623 ff.). The note on the Parodos, in particular, read in conjunction with pp. 111-14, 727-30 (on 1535 f.), could hardly be bettered as an introduction to the religious thought of the trilogy. His patient methods, his learning and acumen, are exemplified in such notes as those on 17 (*ἐντέμνων*), 637 (*χωρίς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν*), 806 (*εὐφρων*), 964 (*δόμοισι . . ἐν χρηστηρίοις*), 1316 (*δυσούζω*).⁴ Many points are settled once and for all, and elsewhere the limits of permissible disagreement are more closely defined. The remainder of this review will deal with some cases where Fraenkel seems to be certainly or probably wrong, either on points of detail or on wider issues.

(i) Hundreds of parallels are cited, often with conclusive effect; a few are less apt than others or less aptly applied. (336) Does not Dem. 19. 235, if anything, support Ahrens's view of *ὡς εὐδαίμονες*? (788) The parallels adduced merely bring out the flatness of *δοκεῖν εἶναι*, without some quality being expressed, and therefore support Weil's *εἶνοι*, which is not mentioned, though the note on p. 367 suggests it irresistibly. (818) It is easy to see why Headlam did not cite

¹ Is not Headlam's *ὑπατηλεχέων* too summarily dismissed? *ὑπατος* (55) really tells against *ὑπατοι* (51); and Weil's in *altiore etiam loco* gives the show away.

² On Fraenkel's own interpretation of this difficult passage, if the *ἀρκυς* is to be the garment, it is hard to resist Risberg's *ξύεργος*, the combination of which with *ξύναρτία* might

be supported by reference to 1486.

³ Here, and on 1470 (*ισόφυχον*), Fraenkel contributes a valuable examination of compounds with *ισο-*.

⁴ This interesting note occupies more than three pages. I ask those who criticize the length of the commentary to say what should have been omitted from it.

these fifth-century instances of *νῦν ἔτι*, none of which is strictly comparable, least of all *Sept.* 708. (1431) *ἀκούεις* may well be right, but its use in introducing a fresh point can hardly be supported by *κλύεις* at 348, which, like the passage there quoted, has a backward reference.

(ii) The following passages in which I find the interpretation unconvincing are taken from the Parodos and the Cassandra scene. (90) The defence of *τῶν τ' οὐρανίων* is weak, and its weakness is exposed by the citation of *Sept.* 271 f., which give two naturally contrasted spheres of operation for *πολισσοῦχοι θεοί*. To say here that *οὐρανίων* 'refers to a sphere of activity different from that of the *ἀγοραῖοι*' is flat in the extreme. But, after *ὑπάτων . . . χθονίων*, there must be a contrasted pair, and *τῶν τε θυραίων* (Enger) provides such a contrast in the household and the community—a contrast essential to the trilogy. (165) Here Fraenkel seems to be the victim of an excess of cleverness which he might have castigated in a Plüss. '*τὸ μάταν ἄχθος* is the burden of the folly which induces men to believe that Zeus is not the almighty ruler.' But this is not felt as a burden by those who disbelieve; and it is a lame conclusion to say that the only cure for lack of faith in Zeus is—faith in Zeus. Hermann and Headlam are, surely, right. *τὸ μ. ἄ.* is the burden of the Elders' fears; and the difference between *μάταν* here and *οὔτοι ματᾶζει* at 995 reflects the development of the play's action.¹ (247) *τὰ ἔνθεν* cannot include the final capture of Troy, of which the Elders are not yet informed. Nor does *τὰ δ' ἔνθεν κτλ.* indicate 'that the Elders have themselves experienced in Aulis the events which they have so far been telling'. The reverse: for *τὰ ἔνθεν* relates primarily, if not exclusively, to the sacrifice (Sidgwick's excellent comment is quoted), which they must have seen if they saw the preliminaries. (1109) 'The prophetess sees the woman moving about as she assists with the bath, but does not yet know what her future intentions are.' This goes too far, in a generally successful attempt to trace the stages of Cassandra's vision. If she does not know the *τέλος*, how can she call it *τόδε*? And does not *ἀλκά* (1104) already imply a murderous attack? (1152) *δυσφάτω κλαγγᾷ*. Passow is hardly justified in saying that *κλαγγή* is 'also used of articulated tones'. In Soph. *Trach.* 208 it clearly refers to ritual cries (not to 'the song of the Chorus'), and in this passage, probably, to *ὡ ὡ* (*et similia*)—cries which are described here with the adjective *δυσφάτος* ('ill-omened') as *ὁσοτοιοί* at 1078 with the verb *δυσφημεῖν*.² The *ὄρθιοι νόμοι* alone are the strains of her articulate song. (1236) 'Clytemnestra's bloody deed is never [apart from 1386 f.] compared with an act of sacrifice.' It is at 1118, and associated with an *ὀλοθυγή*.

(iii) Fraenkel criticizes Verrall and Headlam (I, pp. 57, 59) for a tendency to find double meanings and psychological subtleties in the words of the poet instead of 'simple grandeur'. It would be wrong to suppose that F.'s own interpretations lack subtlety: they are sometimes extremely, and admirably, subtle (see on 429, 437 ff., 455). But verbal ambiguities he tends to reject;³ and those who

¹ Fraenkel, like Wilamowitz, takes *σπλάγχνα δ' οὔτοι μ. κτλ.* as a general statement. But would Aeschylus have regarded this as a valid generalization? (D. H. Lawrence would have, but that is another matter.) I suggest that this is no more general than the statement about *σπλάγχνα* in *Cho.* 413.

² These *δυσ*-compounds are related to the employment of *εὖ* and *εὐ*-compounds which

is such a feature of the trilogy, and a study of which might reveal the virtues of Headlam's *εὐήγορον* (346) and Karsten's *εὐφάτως* (706).

³ Not always. Those which he postulates in the notes on *ξύνευνος* (1116, top of p. 505), *μελαγκέρω* (1127, p. 514), and *οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν* (1653, p. 790) are of a particularly subtle type.

regard this means of conveying irony as particularly characteristic of the poet will feel here a limitation in Fraenkel's criticism. The presence of verbal ambiguity can seldom be proved or disproved, and it is not always very important one way or the other. But I cannot help thinking that Fraenkel's interpretation of the Herald scene suffers throughout from a failure to detect sinister undertones. The note on the Herald (pp. 293 f.) makes some excellent points. He is 'a living and well-rounded figure . . . not harassed by evil forebodings and a feeling of approaching doom'. It is all the more telling, therefore, that he should be forced back again and again to sinister themes; and in the end it turns out that this man of 'unqualified optimism' has all the time been concealing news of a terrible disaster—a dramatic master-stroke of which Fraenkel gives no hint. It is thus misleading to describe the episode as 'a lull before the breaking of the storm'. It is rather an integral part of the crescendo of foreboding which leads up to the murder of the king.

(iv) It is doubtless too much to ask Fraenkel to reconsider his view of Agamemnon, who is presented as 'a great gentleman', while the attribution to him of weakness is firmly repudiated. The 'carpet' scene is crucial. He rightly sees that 'the clue to Agamemnon's behaviour must be found in the play itself' (p. 441), not in mere symbolism. Two reasons are given: Agamemnon's reluctance to get the better of a woman' (on which I offer no comment), and a kind of emotional exhaustion or resignation to defeat (for which the text provides no specific evidence, though Aeschylus could easily have conveyed it if he had wished). It is of course difficult to avoid subjective impressions, particularly in judging the tone of Agamemnon's first speech.¹ The stichomythia admits of more precise treatment. Here Fraenkel involves himself in a complicated and unconvincing interpretation of 939 f., on the assumption that Agamemnon must, as previously, pick up Clytemnestra's remark. But supposing he has no answer and tacitly admits the point?² At Aulis, too, Fraenkel seeks the best construction:³ 'The moment he calls one of [the possible lines of conduct] by its true name, *λιπόναν γενέσθαι*, his mind is made up. . . . Such an action would be criminal for any member of the expedition, how much more for the supreme commander' (pp. 122 f.). But this is a mere sophism: someone must have the authority to countermand the expedition, and who if not the supreme commander, in whose family interest the expedition is made? The sophism is Agamemnon's, and the true indictment against him is that he not only regards the alternatives as of approximately equal awfulness, but chooses the worse and can regard it as *θέμις*. The whole problem is too complex for discussion here. But I must confess I am confirmed in a theory that the better the scholar, the worse he argues a bad case.

These criticisms, over-dogmatic for the sake of brevity, relate only to a fraction of the total commentary. It remains to express the warmest admiration

¹ Fraenkel's demonstration that *τοὺς ἐμοὶ μεταίτιους* (811) does not imply arrogance is already familiar.

² In general, I prefer Thomson's interpretation of the stichomythia: see also *J.H.S.* lxxviii. 133. As to 939 ff., is it really credible that Agamemnon takes the *ἐπιζήλος* in Clytemnestra's 'platitude' as though she were seeking to involve him in a conflict with

rivals? No wonder she missed the point in her reply!

³ See, e.g., the note on *μάντιν οὐρα ψέγων* (186) and a further reference on p. 441. Headlam's interpretation seems preferable, if only because Agamemnon ought not to receive a pat on the back immediately before *ἐμπαιούς τύχαιοι σπινέων*.

and gratitude for a notable contribution to the study of Aeschylus, a monument of scholarship of which our generation may well be proud.

Westfield College, London

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM

MEDIEVAL EDITIONS OF SOPHOCLES

(1) ALEXANDER TURYN: *The Sophocles Recension of Manuel Moschopulus*. Extracted from Transactions of the American Philological Association, vol. lxxx (1949), pp. 94-173.

(2) ROBERT AUBRETON: *Démétrius Triclinius et les Recensions Médiévales de Sophocle*. Pp. 289. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949. Paper.

(1) THIS article marks the second stage in the comprehensive investigation of the manuscript tradition of Sophocles which Turyn began in *Traditio*, ii (1944), pp. 10-41; see *C.R.* lx (1946), pp. 23-4. Turyn here sets himself the limited objective of distinguishing between the various Byzantine recensions, with the particular purpose of identifying those extant manuscripts which are derived from the Moschopulean recension of the triad (*Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*), in his view the most important contribution of Byzantine scholarship to the subject. There appear to have been four main recensions, those of Planudes, Moschopulus (for the triad), Thomas Magister (for the triad and at least the *Antigone* in addition), and Triclinius, to put them in their probable chronological order. Turyn's main evidence for assigning a text to any of these traditions is the set of scholia which accompanies it or which it reflects. He proves conclusively that many exegetical scholia which since they were first printed by Turnebus have been ascribed to Triclinius were in fact the work of Thomas and that the very common set of scholia first printed by Johnson from two Bodleian manuscripts was the work of Moschopulus. He also identifies a set of Planudean scholia, though he reserves a detailed account of these for the present. He does, however, note that there was some combination of the Planudean and Moschopulean traditions and distinguishes between two classes of Moschopulean manuscripts, one containing only Moschopulean scholia, the other containing in addition some Planudean scholia, though providing very few differences in the text.

Turyn lists about seventy manuscripts which he regards as Moschopulean either in whole or in part and therefore as valueless for establishing the true text of Sophocles. When these manuscripts offer readings not supported by the *veteres* he assumes that these readings must be inventions or conjectures of Moschopulus with no more, if no less, authority than any other conjecture. Actually few of these manuscripts have ever been used by editors; but one—and here is the really surprising outcome of Turyn's investigation—is Parisinus 2712, the famous A which has since Brunck been regarded as a representative of the *veteres* equal if not actually superior in authority to the eleventh-century Laurentian manuscript L. Turyn himself so regarded it when he wrote his paper in *Traditio*, but now he moves it (without argument) from the thirteenth century to the fourteenth and asserts (with argument) that A, like Venetus 467 (ven c in Pearson's Oxford text) which he calls A's twin brother, is an ordinary Moschopulean manuscript of the Planudean branch and should in future be

treated as such. He further asserts that where L has in the triad been corrected so as to give readings of A, the corrections were made by the scribe who wrote A and therefore have as little authority as the readings of A itself.

We have still to learn what Turyn's considered opinion will be of the text of A in the other four plays, but it seems that he expects to show that it is an old text largely interpolated and corrected from many sources including Thomas and Triclinius, so that here too A will fall from the place of honour to which it has for so long been accustomed. The conclusions are startling, and if they prove to be true they will involve a fundamental reconsideration of the text of many passages in the plays. But until the position has been more completely investigated it will perhaps be rash to exclude the possibility that A was after all written in the thirteenth century and that the relationship between it and Moschopulean manuscripts for the triad and Thoman and Triclinian manuscripts for the other plays is due to the fact that the Byzantine scholars used A as one of their sources rather than to the fact that A was derived from them.

(2) Aubreton, to whom Turyn's article on Moschopulus was of course unknown, starts with an examination of many of the same manuscripts and a discussion of some of the same problems; but his quarry is Triclinius and his object first to isolate, then to assess, the contribution made by Triclinius to Sophoclean studies. Though he argues on different lines and at much greater length, he has no more difficulty than Turyn in demonstrating that most of the exegetical scholia which have been commonly attributed to Triclinius since Turnebus first printed them in 1553 are Thoman and that the set of scholia described by Dindorf (1852) as *σχόλια νεώτερα* are Moschopulean. After a careful analysis of the contents of a considerable number of manuscripts he concludes that Parisinus 2711 (T) contains not only Triclinius' text but also all the genuine Triclinian scholia, both metrical and exegetical, and he lists the latter noting the confirmation, when available, of Vindobonensis 163 (saec. xiv), containing the triad, and of Estensis *a*, Q. 5, 20 (saec. xv), containing scholia on the triad and the *Antigone*. The scholia listed are the scholia, other than metrical scholia, of which the initial letter in T is black; the other exegetical scholia, to be assigned to Thomas, have an initial red letter. Aubreton argues that this method was adopted by the scribe of T for the express purpose of distinguishing Triclinian from other scholia, and he supports his view by citing from Dresdensis 21 (Da) the following note: *τὰ περὶ τῶν μέτρων Δημητρίου ἐστὶ Τρικλινίου καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διὰ μέλανος ἔχουσι*. If Da did in fact ascribe to Triclinius the scholia listed from T by Aubreton, his thesis could be regarded as proved; unfortunately, however, the manuscript was badly damaged during the war. (Turyn indeed writes both the Dresden manuscripts off as destroyed, but Aubreton's information is that Da, though it can no longer be photographed, might yield some of its secrets if it could be inspected.)

In the second part of his book Aubreton first attempts to discover on what manuscripts or manuscript tradition Triclinius founded his own text and then goes on to analyse the nature and value of the readings that he introduced and of his metrical and other notes. After discussing the relationship between L and A, which he regards as representatives of two ancient traditions (he has no suspicions about the integrity of A), he calls attention to the affinities of a number of other manuscripts which seem to him to be significant and shows what T has in common with one or more of them. His conclusion is that in the fourteenth century there were three main traditions represented by L, A,

and Moschopulus (or Planudes) respectively, that Thomas and Triclinius were responsible for two new traditions founded on a conflation of the traditions of L and A, Triclinius drawing upon Thomas as well as upon the old traditions but less so in the triad than in the other plays, and that the old tradition used by both scholars was principally that of L for the triad and the *Antigone*, but that of A for the *Oedipus Coloneus*, the *Trachiniae*, and the *Philoctetes*. He then considers the principles which seem to have guided Triclinius in preferring one traditional reading to another or in introducing new readings. He finds that in general Triclinius was influenced by metrical considerations, particularly in lyrics, and shows how he was at pains to apply to Sophocles the metrical rules laid down by Hephaestion and to achieve by textual changes where necessary complete correspondence between strophe and antistrophe. He also expounds the colometrical symbols employed by Heliodorus (first century A.D.) and adopted by Hephaestion, and illustrates the way in which Triclinius uses and explains them. Triclinius' preoccupation with metre is further demonstrated by the metrical scholia and by the metrical implications of a number of the so-called exegetical scholia. Metrical considerations do not account for all the changes that Triclinius made in the text of Sophocles and there are scholia which bear witness to his interest in questions of grammar, dialect, and orthography as well as in questions of interpretation; but Aubreton's judgement seems to be sound (p. 220): 'L'œuvre de Triclinius est donc avant tout celle d'un métricien'.

In the final section of his book Aubreton deals with the influence exerted by Triclinius on subsequent Sophoclean studies. Only a few extant manuscripts can be regarded as truly Triclinian; Aubreton lists six, including T, and mentions three others as possibilities. (Perhaps he should have added Venetus 470 of which the text, according to Turyn, agrees closely with T though it does not contain at all a complete set of Triclinian scholia.) These manuscripts suggest that Triclinius' work passed through several stages and was never completed. It is noticeable that Triclinian scholia, even metrical scholia, are much less frequent for the *O.C.*, *Trach.*, and *Phil.* than for the other plays, and it is probably fair to deduce that Triclinius, though he revised the text for all seven plays, did not have time to finish his commentary. His text, however, as printed with reasonable faithfulness by Turnebus in 1553, became the basis of almost all other printed texts until Brunck in 1786 introduced A. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars have been less inclined than Triclinius to attempt to make the text of Sophocles conform to a preconceived pattern and they have tended to put faith in what they have believed to be the ancient traditions represented by A and (since Elmsley) L. Most of the textual changes introduced by Triclinius have therefore been discarded, and even if Turyn's view of A is accepted, future editors are unlikely to return to Triclinius; they will try to establish the text on the evidence of L and other manuscripts related to L which have recently come to light. But Aubreton is right in suggesting that the fact that Triclinius is now out of date should not blind us to the merits of his work in its own time. His book is welcome not only for what it tells us about the work of Triclinius but also for the light that it throws on the fortunes of the text of Sophocles in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. Aubreton and Turyn do not see eye to eye on all points, but between them they have done much to clarify the position.

Trinity College, Cambridge

R. M. RATTENBURY

THE HELEN OF EURIPIDES

Euripides: *Helen*. Edited with commentary and general remarks by A. Y. CAMPBELL. Pp. xviii+172. Liverpool: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR CAMPBELL's edition of the *Helen* is distinguished by all the qualities we have learnt to expect from his work; a power of searching scrutiny, combined with a tendency to literal-mindedness in interpretation, a breath-taking boldness in emendation supported by considerable dexterity and knowledge of Greek usage, but limited by a strong preference for logic rather than sense. He is a good judge of other men's work, but has an almost Ovidian tenderness for his own ingenuities. And he differs from practically all that portion of mankind which is interested in such matters in his estimate of what can be achieved by taking thought. 'So do all things work together for good to those who really believe in scholarship. . . . In ninety-five cases out of a hundred the problems, provided they are thrown wide open and tackled methodically and (by experiment) exhaustively, can be pushed to a conclusion that is in all essentials decisive' (p. 66). Those who do not share this view of the nature of the problem are unlikely to accept a large proportion of the 150 or so emendations of his own which C. prints in his text together with nine new iambs, with which he fills lacunae for the most part unsuspected before, and numerous transpositions.

'I have done all I could to make the text of this play a substantially perfect restoration and to expound it (so far as necessary) only in that form' (p. xv). The text so restored is printed without apparatus, and followed by 100 pages of notes in which the manuscript reading is printed in brackets where Campbell has departed from it, and the text and emendations are discussed. In view of the size of the editor's contribution it is natural that the notes should be concerned mainly with his own suggestions; indeed he expresses regret more than once that the shortage of paper prevents him from tracing fully the arguments which have led him to some of his more complicated conclusions.

It is impossible to mention more than a small number of Campbell's emendations. Here, by way of sample, is his text of lines 769-78:

ME.	εἰ γὰρ ἐμπλήσασαί σε μύθων, λέγων τ' ἄν σοι κάκ' ἀλγοῖν ἐγώ, πάσχων τ' ἑκαμνον δις δὲ λυπηθεῖμεν ἄν.	770
EA.	ἀλγίον' αἰδῶς εἰ σ' ἀνηρόμην μ' ἔχει. ἐν δ' εἰπὲ πάντα παραλιπών, πόσον χρόνον πόντου 'πὶ νώτοις ἄλιον ἐφθείρου πλάνον;	
ME.	ἐναυστόλουν πρὸς τοῖσιν ἐν Τροίᾳ δέκα ἔτεσι διελθὼν ἑπτὰ περιδρομάς ἑτῶν.	775
EA.	φεῦ, φεῦ· μακρόν γ' ἔλεξας, ὦ τάλας, χρόνον, νῦν δ' οὐδὲ μείναι δυνατόν ἐξευρόντι με. φεῦ γ' ὡς τάχιστα τῆσδ' ἀπαλλαχθεὶς χθόνος· σωθεὶς ἐκείθεν ἐνθάδ' ἦλθες ἐς σφαγὰς.	777a 780 778

770 εἰ MSS. and edd. ἐγώ C. "because 'the true rhetoric' demands it."

772 κάλλιον εἶπας ἢ σ' ἀνηρόμην ἐγώ MSS. and most edd. This is intelligible though not wholly satisfying; hence Nauck suggested καὶ πλείον'. Campbell's line is no more intelligible and is a piece of sheer rewriting.

775-6. ἐνιούσιον . . . διήλθον MSS., usually changed to ἐναυστίους. There can

be no doubt that Campbell's text is much more readable and an improvement on Apelt's *ἐν ναυσὶν ὦν*. But the old text is possible and the emphasis due to the order is not misplaced.

777-8. Of the lines in the traditional order Campbell observes, 'An inconceivable speech; it would be so even if it were not brutal because it is cold'. No one can deny that he has here shown a courage to match the strength of his conviction. It is true that the traditional text introduces a new subject with some abruptness, but if we pause to imagine the play in action, what a chance for an actor! If he knew his job, these lines were neither cold nor brutal. It is a pity to go to so much trouble to spoil a good dramatic moment.

These suggestions are typical of many in their faults and virtues. We find the same hastiness in resorting to emendation: *πρόμοις* for *χθονί* 38, γ' *ἔχει* for *λέγεις* 125, *Τεύκρων* . . . *ἔναρα* for *νεκρῶν* . . . *ὀνόματα* 399, *ἐκτοπος* for *ἐν δόμοις* 477, *ὄργαι* for *ἔργα* 708, because *ἔργα* and *ἔρις* are not *in pari materia*, *τοῦνομα παρ' ἀστοῖς* μὴ τὸ σῶμ' *ἐν βαρβάρους*, for *τοῦνομα παρασχουσ'*, οὐ τὸ σῶμ', *ἐν βαρβάρους*, 1100 *ξυνέριθος* for *ξυνεργός* 1113.

The traditional text, Campbell complains, perpetually makes Euripides write 'just off the true'. Not everyone will be ready to assert with the same confidence the limits of what is possible in Greek. Is οὐτ' ἂν δακρῶσαι βλέφαρα 948 quite out of the question? He has no hesitation in writing οὐ τὰ μὰ δεῦσαι βλέφαρα, and rather in the same spirit *φαρμάκων* for *δωμάτων* at 1104.

483-5 now reads as follows:

συμφορὰς γὰρ ἀντίας
ἧ 'κ τῶν πάροιθεν πως παρεστῶσας κλύω.
ἧ τήν . . .

with mark of interrogation at 488. It is fatuous, he says, for Menelaus to consider it a disaster if someone else of the same name as Helen does live in Egypt. Whether or not Menelaus is capable of fatuity is another question, but seeing he has just been told that Helen, the daughter of Zeus, from Lacedaemon is living in Egypt, he may be forgiven for speaking of *συμφοραί* and at the same time wondering in his bewilderment whether the explanation may not lie in a confusion of names. It goes well enough on the stage in English.

On the other hand, Campbell's text is often easier than the old and sometimes an improvement on it. 119 *σκοπεῖ δέ for σκοπεῖτε* is clearly right; Teucer alone is here addressed, not Teucer and the Greeks. 635 *χρόνιον ὡς λάβω* gets rid of a very feeble line. 925 *τέχνης* for *τύχης* and 1192 *δέμας* for *φρένας* are plausible. 936 *ἐν πέρα 'φατίζετο* (*πέρα Hermann*) gives the required sense, but an exact parallel to this use of *φατίζομαι* would be to the point. At 1575, where the manuscripts give *ὄρθια* or *ὄρθρια*, *ὄρια* explained by Hesychius as *νεώρια* (cf. 1530) is a better emendation than the generally accepted *ρόθια*. 226 *νυμφίος* for *κύμασι τε* reads much more easily, but can Menelaus be called a *νυμφίος* at this stage in his married life? 577 *τὸ δ' ἀσαφές μ' ἀποστρέφει* and 1038 *χρη' τὸδ' ἐς κοινὸν λέγειν* are worth considering, and at 1153 *ἀνόμους* is more logical than *πόνους*, but the change is unnecessary if due emphasis is placed on *ἀμαθῶς*.

The notes are followed by some 'Remarks on the Play', in which Campbell returns to a rather old-fashioned view of the character of Menelaus. But it is clear that the editor's real business is with the 'good fat crux'. Those who have the same preference will find much to enjoy in this book even if they do not find much with which to agree.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

FROM THALES TO ARISTOTLE

W. K. C. GUTHRIE: *The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle*. (Home Study Books, 9.) Pp. v+168. London: Methuen, 1950. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS little book contains much to interest students and teachers of Greek philosophy. Unlike most doxographers, ancient and modern, Mr. Guthrie avoids presenting the reader with masses of unrelated opinions. Whether he is dealing with individual thinkers or with successive movements of thought he makes coherence his aim, and is remarkably successful in achieving it; as befits a student of Aristotle his procession of facts and ideas moves in the order of probability and necessity. In spite of the inevitable brevity of treatment many of the Greek thinkers, especially those who survive only in fragments, seem actually to gain in vividness and intelligibility by having their salient features selected and combined.

Guthrie has good reasons for discarding certain current versions of the standpoint of the Milesians (for example, that they were simply talking about the weather); reviving Aristotle's suggestion regarding Thales, he is disposed to think that they were influenced by the phenomena of living matter and its processes of generation and growth. He enters a sound caveat against the literalism which has led some to interpret Anaxagoras' *νοῦς* as material—but would not the same note on the 'metaphorical uses of physical terms' have been relevant to the treatment of Heraclitus' *λόγος*, and perhaps also elsewhere, for example, in explaining Empedocles' 'material' forces of attraction and repulsion? It is Parmenides, however, who gets the credit of being 'the first to exalt the intelligible at the expense of the sensible', though the question whether he was an idealist or a materialist is called 'unanswerable', on the ground that Anaxagoras was the first to draw a clear distinction between mind and matter. Plato had no doubt that Parmenides was on the side of the 'gods' against the 'giants'; but Guthrie will allow only that Parmenides' reality was 'non-sensible, only to be reached by thought', a remark which would apply almost as well to Heraclitus or the Atomists with their distrust of the senses. He describes the Pythagoreans as 'moral dualists'; perhaps in deference to Cornford, he does not seem quite convinced that they were also metaphysical dualists from the beginning. He has an excellent account of their doctrine of 'harmonia'; and is (in consequence, I believe) silent on the ill-founded notion that they called the soul a harmony. The services of Socrates to philosophy are described in agreement with the testimony of Aristotle; on Plato also Guthrie sets aside the fantastic theories of some moderns and follows traditional lines. The section on Aristotle is notable for the fruitful treatment of Aristotle's ambiguities on the life of reason; Guthrie, one imagines, must have risen to real eloquence at this point in the course of lectures to non-classical undergraduates which formed the basis of this book. But, to be candid, the effect of this passage is slightly spoiled by some appearances elsewhere of what one may presume to call misology; at any rate he seems to hold that differences between philosophers are rooted in temperament rather than in rational reflection upon experience, and that therefore it is 'impossible' for either teleologists or anti-teleologists to convince their opponents 'by argument'. This pessimism seems to me as un-Hellenic as it is unjustified. Perhaps it is not unconnected with Guthrie's finding the Greeks

strangely 'foreign' in their ways of thinking, and imagining 'a thick screen' between us and such discussions as the *Cratylus*, which other moderns have found very relevant in its treatment of the relation of language to thought and reality.

On Guthrie's account of the general historical development there is one criticism that must be made. It is said that in the second half of the fifth century the choice for the 'ordinary man' (p. 63) was between Eleaticism and Atomism (p. 65). Similarly, the effect of Atomism in producing the 'common scepticism' of the Sophists seems—since Democritus was not born till 460 B.C.—exaggerated; the part played by Eleatic logic-chopping in aiding this result seems to go unnoticed. Again, it is implied (p. 116) that Plato's opponents in *Laws* x were Atomists; but since most of them asserted that motion had a beginning this label would be misapplied. It seems clear that Archelaus and other followers of Anaxagoras had more to do with fifth- and fourth-century scepticism than had the Atomists. Guthrie apparently underrates the importance of Anaxagoras, whose theory of nature he calls merely 'a kind of halfway house' to Atomism. Though Anaxagoras' followers blurred his clear distinction between mind and matter, and therefore, like the Atomists, mark a retrogression in the flow of philosophic thought, their materialism, to judge from *Laws* x, was of a subtler brand than Atomism and, for whatever reason, bulked more large in the mind of Plato.¹

When the task of selection has been so well and so courageously done, it would be foolish to complain of omissions. But I would suggest that a reference to Heraclitus' fragment on human laws (that they are 'nurtured' by the divine law) would have helped to prepare for the later exposition of Plato's defence of law. Since Epicurus' reliance on Democritus is mentioned, the often forgotten indebtedness of the Stoics to Heraclitus might well have been included. Room could have been made for such matters by removing some of the items in the first chapter, for example, Wilamowitz's dogma that *θεός* 'has primarily a predicative force', which—and this is a measure of its usefulness—has no relevance to anything else in the book. Nor does it seem likely that Guthrie will persuade future lexicographers that *ἀπερή* 'meant, in fact, efficiency', a word of dreadful associations, for which he himself soon substitutes 'excellence'.

I do not care for the word 'prohairesis' (p. 154). Nor do I find that Thrasy-machus 'departs' at the end of *Rep.* i; indeed, he seems to be still present at the discussion in vi. 498 cd. But these are trivialities.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

PHILOSOPHICAL TEXTS

C. J. DE VOGEL: *Greek Philosophy*. A collection of texts selected and supplied with some notes and explanations. Volume I: *Thales to Plato*. Pp. xii + 318. Leiden: Brill, 1950. Cloth, gld. 19.

THIS is a most useful book. Written by the Professor of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy in the University of Utrecht, it is designed to supply a more modern equivalent of Ritter and Preller's *Historia Philosophiae Graecae*, and should be

¹ See *C.Q.* xxx. 52-4.

especially suitable for University courses in Greek philosophy. It is to be completed in 1952 by a second volume which will deal with Aristotle and post-Aristotelian philosophy.

In general the selection of passages and their arrangement follow the pattern of Ritter and Preller. The following are the main departures: in the headings and elsewhere Latin is replaced by English, the elaborate learned notes of R.P. are dropped, and in their place there are brief but sufficient footnotes giving translations of difficult phrases and discussing important variant readings and emendations. From time to time a numbered section is included, giving the briefest possible statement of divergent modern interpretations of major problems with bibliographical references. The space devoted to the Pre-Socratics is slightly reduced mainly by shortening the passages given; the Sophists have about three times as much as they had, Socrates, the Minor Socratics, and Plato have all considerably increased attention. In the case of Socrates and Plato the dropping of the notes in R.P. has made possible much more extensive extracts, of a page or two in extent. At the end there is an eight-page classified bibliography of modern works and indexes of names and subjects. A larger page and better spacing and typography make the book attractive and convenient to use.

The following detailed points are offered without calling in question the general excellence of the book. For the Pre-Socratics it might have been better always to have given both the ancient reference and the reference number to Diels-Kranz, as teachers will probably want to use the present book alongside Diels-Kranz. For the earlier Pre-Socratics chronological material is omitted, and in the case of Anaximander something about his writings might have been included. There is full cover for the cosmologies and philosophic doctrines of the Pre-Socratics, but moral and political ideas might have been given a little more space—this is especially the case with the Pythagoreans. Under Anaximander, R.P. 21 on the gods might have been kept. Under Pythagoras and the older Pythagoreans one might like to see the monad, and the method of generating lines and planes from numbers. In the case of Parmenides No. 85 it should be mentioned that the second $\psi\phi'$ ϕ is not a manuscript reading, nor the only possible one. On p. 42 the reference immediately above the diagram should apparently be to Fig. 1, not to Fig. 2. Under the Sophists, Hippias is dealt with a little scantily, and Antiphon, apparently included by an afterthought, is quite inadequate. The treatment of Socrates is excellent; the use of extensive extracts from Plato enables a full picture to be given of his life and likely doctrines which is in line with modern discussions. But there is nothing about any Socratic views on the soul. The political doctrines of the Cynics deserve more attention, unless these are reserved for the second volume.

The treatment of Plato is built about the theory of Ideas, with the addition of what is virtually a summary of the contents of the *Republic* in extracts occupying 34 pages, and 18 pages from the *Laws*. The approach seems to follow the lines of the authoress's *Een keerpunt in Plato's denken*, Amsterdam, 1936, discussed in *C.R.* 1 (1936), 220. The result is to give a certain didactic unity to the treatment which is not without advantages. Definite guidance is given on many major problems, but the Line and the Cave, probably wisely, are left unexpounded, though the text is given fully. The section dealing with the Ideal Numbers is likely to be particularly useful. The whole arrangement of the Plato section is new and is far superior to the formal divisions of R.P. To the biblio-

graph
Critical
The
rather
Thro
litera
and t
are m
book
Class

Univer

ERN
1950

PRO
ties a
of no
comp
meth
teach
fund
ing.
polit
wave
artic
the l

Th
men
spher
the c
the
the c
of b
wor
dyna
prin
The
perc
From
of o

T
extr
seer
war
For
G.

graphy at the end of the book one might perhaps add Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Pre-Socratic Philosophy*, 1935, and possibly Zeller-Mondolfo.

This is a book written with a definite purpose, for the teacher and student rather than for the research worker. As such, it should satisfy a real need. Throughout, the emphasis is on philosophic doctrines and speculations; literary questions, the successions of philosophers and schools, religious ideas, and the political affiliations of philosophers are scarcely touched on. But these are matters which may be developed in teaching if desired, and the present book provides a very adequate tool for the teaching of Greek philosophy to Classical students.

University of Manchester

G. B. KERFERD

PLATO

ERNST HOFFMANN: *Platon*. Pp. 222; 1 plate. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1950. Cloth.

PROFESSOR HOFFMANN gave fourteen lectures on Plato to students of all faculties at Heidelberg in the winter of 1946-7. With the addition of some thirty pages of notes they are now published in book form in the Erasmus Bibliothek, which comprises 'Schriften zur Formung der abendländischen Persönlichkeit'. The method used in introducing Plato is not to give a summary of his works and teaching, but to attempt a statement of the springs of Plato's thought, the fundamental principles of his final metaphysic which lay behind all his thinking. This is the subject-matter of the whole course and from necessity Plato's political and ethical views are discussed rather incidentally. But there is no wavering in the main assault, and there emerges a brilliant picture of a highly articulated philosophic position. The fine clarity of exposition must have made the lectures an intellectual pleasure to those who heard them.

There are for Plato, on Hoffmann's interpretation, three fundamental elements in Reality: (1) the empirical world which is the world of the senses, the sphere of Becoming, (2) the world of Ideas which is the world of Being, and (3) the divine principle, God, which is beyond Being, the Idea of the Good. God is the source of all that is dynamic in Reality and is both the God of Being and the God of Becoming. God as Idea of the Good is transcendent to the world of becoming, but as principle of activity he is also immanent in it. In fact the world of becoming is not really ultimate; it is the product of Space and the dynamic principle drawing Space (Not-Being) towards Being. The dynamic principle operates as soul. Two lectures are devoted to the Line and the Cave. The four sections of the Line represent Words (*εἰκασία*), Objects of sense-perception, Concepts in the mind (*Begriffe*, τὰ μαθηματικά), and the Ideas. From these starting-points the analysis is extended to Dialectic, Plato's theory of opposition, the relationship of the Ideas to one another, etc.

There is material here for endless discussion, and there is much that is extremely stimulating in Hoffmann's detailed development of these ideas. But it seems best to select two general points for comment. Plato himself gave a clear warning that his philosophy as a whole could not be derived from his dialogues. For English readers the obvious comparison with the present book will be G. C. Field's *The Philosophy of Plato*. There can be no question that Hoffmann

assigns to Plato a great deal that Plato nowhere actually says, and the scholarly caution of Professor Field leaves many questions open to which Hoffmann gives full and confident answers. But this is not the end of the matter. There are times when nothing less than a whole philosophy will do. If Platonism is to make its contribution to the modern world it must be made to speak clearly on fundamental points and this need presumably was not absent in Germany in 1946. But it would surely be wise when following this path to make clear the method adopted, and to make it much more plain than the present lectures do how involved in doubt the whole matter must necessarily be.

Secondly, if it is permissible on occasion to go beyond what Plato says, it is essential that in doing so we should not go against what he has actually given us. The whole synthesis of the present lectures rests on the identification, or something nearly approaching it, of the Idea of the Good, God, the Demiurge, and the One, and the doctrine that from this essentially theistic entity springs all the activity in the universe. It should be sufficient here to mention Cornford's *Timaeus* (which is not referred to by Hoffmann) and Professor Skemp's *Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues*. Not only did Plato not make any such identification, but there are now available definite reasons for supposing that he thought in such a way as positively to preclude it. If this is so, then the picture of Plato's thought given in the present lectures is fundamentally defective.

On other matters of Platonic scholarship there will be found much of interest, particularly in the importance attached to Comedy in explaining Plato's literary form. But the view that the earlier dialogues, including the *Protagoras*, are simply prose comedies and have no doctrinal content at all must be firmly rejected (cf. J. Moreau, *La Construction de l'idéalisme platonicien*, 1939, for a juster appraisal).

University of Manchester

G. B. KERFERD

ESSAYS BY F. M. CORNFORD

F. M. CORNFORD: *The Unwritten Philosophy and other Essays*. Edited with an introductory memoir by W. K. C. GUTHRIE. Pp. xix + 139. Cambridge: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

IN this volume Mr. W. K. C. Guthrie has brought together some essays written by Cornford at various dates between 1921 and his death in 1943, only a few of which had been previously published. He has added a useful bibliography of Cornford's writings on classical subjects, and in a graceful introductory memoir has given the reader a clue to the development of Cornford's interests and of his method of interpretation. It is to be hoped that this story will somewhere be told at greater length. The excellence of Cornford's work on the dialogues of Plato is such that I, for one, cannot help regarding this as the real *τέλος* of his development.

There is no need to emphasize here that unique combination of gifts which made him so admirable a commentator on Plato; and I think that these essays mostly speak for themselves. The earlier ones have lost none of their interest. I should have liked to see some of Cornford's contributions to the *Classical Quarterly* reprinted in this volume. He did, it is true, reproduce the substance

of his essays on Pythagoreanism in the book on *Plato and Parmenides*; but his valuable study of Anaxagoras does not seem to be as well known as it ought to be, especially to foreign students. It might be said that these papers are of an 'exoteric' nature, but they seem in fact to be designed for various audiences and exhibit a corresponding variety of style, and it does not seem that articles from a learned journal would have been out of place among them.

Detailed criticism of the contents of the essays would be inappropriate here, but I should like to ask whether it is true that 'when Plato composed the *Phaedo* he had come to see in this reorientation of philosophy (sc. the attempt to divert it from the study of nature and make it 'frankly moral and anthropocentric') the essential achievement of his master'?

The Socrates of the *Phaedo* does not say that he experienced a revolution of this kind, still less claim that the time has come for a general reorientation. The narrative upon which he embarks in order to meet the objection of Cebes is expressly said to be concerned with causation, and Socrates says that, when he had reduced himself to perplexity by the direct study of things, he took refuge in λόγος, though he knew that these would not give the perfect explanation of natural phenomena which he required; and that he obtained from them a provisional satisfaction. These λόγος are not moral concepts, but forms like heat, cold, and twoness, which, it is said, provide a more satisfactory account of causation than the processes to which materialists appeal. The whole narrative is personal and there is nothing about pointing out a new task to philosophy.

Nor does Aristotle, in speaking of Socrates, say that he led the way in a general reorientation. In the *Metaphysics* he says that Socrates, in Plato's youth, inquired into ethical concepts and did not study nature as a whole. In the *de Partibus* he says that there was in Socrates' lifetime a decline in natural science, but does not attribute this to the example of Socrates.

It seems to have been Panaetius who derived all later schools of philosophy from Socrates and, in this connexion, made the famous statement that he brought philosophy down from heaven to earth, a verdict which was taken up by Antiochus and, I believe, more than once repeated by Cicero. This may not be vastly different from Aristotle's opinion, but it is quite unlike what Plato says in the *Phaedo*.

University of Edinburgh

D. J. ALLAN

THE PHAEDO IN LATIN

Platonis *Phaedo* interprete Henrico Aristippo. Edidit et praefatione instruxit LAURENTIUS MINIO-PALUELLO. (Plato Latinus, Vol. II.) Pp. xix+156; 3 plates. London: Warburg Institute, 1950. Cloth, 50s. net.

As vol. II of the *Plato Latinus*, this follows upon V. Kordeuter and C. Labowsky's edition of Aristippus' *Meno* (1940). It was preceded by an article in *C.Q.* xliii (1949), pp. 126-9, and now we can see on what Dr. Minio-Paluello there based his pronouncements on the manuscript Aristippus used; but the textual interest of his edition is not exhausted by this, for he now gives many additional conjectured readings, though admittedly these are frequently uncertain.

Aristippus in 1156 translated the *Phaedo* twice, the second version being a

correction of the first from the same manuscript. This second version (H) is given in the text, the variations of the earlier (*h*) being printed below, while Aristippus' own corrections of the latter, as found in interlinear annotations of the Oxford manuscript (Corp. Christi 243 = O), are recorded in an appendix. The evidence for both editions has been carefully studied; the first exists in two manuscripts, the Florentinus, Bibl. Nat., Palat. 639 (F), and the Oxoniensis, while the second is more widely spread, and the Editor counts four sources as independent: Leidensis, Bibl. Publ., Lat. 64 (L); Parisiensis, Bibl. Nat., Lat. 16581 (S); Vaticanus, Lat. 2063 (V); and Marcianus, Lat. VI. 81 (M); together with Trecensis 1236 (*t*), which gives six short fragments. Of these the oldest is S, dating from the middle of the thirteenth century. Three more manuscripts he thinks, with Miss Labowsky, to be derived from L, while Dr. H. J. Drossaart Lulofs has led him to the conclusion that Parisiensis, Bibl. Nat., Lat. 6567 A (P) derives from S. (We are indebted to Dr. Lulofs for the information about S and P, and for a recollection of all the material in the apparatus criticus.)

Burnet at one time took Aristippus' manuscript to be W (on p. lviii of his *Phaedo* he is more cautious), but Dr. Minio-Paluello shows conclusively that it was another member of the same group, which he denominates Φ ; W apart, the manuscript to which it is closest is Δ . He notes the places where Φ 's reading seems to have differed from W's, in some agreeing with one or more of the leading manuscripts (BTY), in others with Δ or some other or others of the *deteriores*, and in yet others being completely individual. Φ 's importance is difficult to assess. Where it agrees with BTY (and sometimes W²) against W, it is nearly always right (at about 38 places; 110 b 1 seems the only exception); on the other hand, at the twelve places where it agrees with Δ against the ordinary tradition it is always, or nearly always, wrong (69 a 9, 70 e 1, 71 e 9, 72 a 11, 82 c 2, 92 e 1, 99 c 5, 100 b 1, 107 d 7, 112 b 1, e 2, 114 b 4): Burnet dismissed Δ as an 'apographon foede mutilatum', and his verdict seems borne out. Elsewhere Φ seems generally in error where it has a reading otherwise confined to the minor manuscripts; but it is interesting that it seems to support (or anticipate) conjectures of Forster ($\pi\omicron\upsilon$, or $\omicron\delta$, at 70 c 5, δ $\tau\iota$ at 95 a 9) and of Schanz ($\omicron\iota$ at 113 a 2), together with the less attractive $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ of Stephanus at 75 b 2; and at 70 e 1, 86 c 5 ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\iota$), and 86 e 4 it gives valuable (though not the sole) evidence for the correct reading; so that in any case the bases hitherto used for the text, BTW (Burnet) or BTWY (Robin), need to be extended. Φ provides an interesting example of a manuscript containing some valuable readings, but at the same time many corruptions of the *deteriores*.

The introduction gives a full and erudite account of what is known of the manuscripts, and an appendix contains a letter of Aristippus about his translation to his English friend Roboratus. There are copious Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek indexes, and plates of O, P, and L. Aristippus' *marginalia* (pp. 101-8) throw interesting light on the medieval approach to Plato.

At the foot of p. 44, '19' in the second apparatus should surely be '18'; for $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ in the app. crit. to p. 63 read $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$. The note 'ad om.' at 74 a 6 seems uncalled for, in view of the Greek $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$. The plate of P gives its number as 5657 A, at variance with the text.

The price is alarmingly high.

THE STOICS

MAX POHLENZ: *Stoa und Stoiker*. Die Gründer, Panaitios, Poseidonios, eingeleitet und übertragen. (Bibliothek der Alten Welt, Griechische Reihe.) Pp. xxix+386. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1950. Cloth, 13.80 Sw. fr.

THE series 'Bibliothek der Alten Welt' is planned to provide new translations into German, with introductions and notes, of all important remains of Greek and Latin literature. The translations are for the most part to be complete, and, as they are intended for the general public, 'Alles Antiquarische wird ferngehalten'. Given these conditions the fragments of the Stoics present considerable problems. Under the general title of 'Stoa und Stoiker', four volumes in the series are to be published, of which the present is vol. i. Vol. ii by K. Preisendanz will cover Seneca, vol. iii (already published) by W. Capelle deals with Epictetus, Teles, and Musonius, and vol. iv will deal with Marcus Aurelius. The present volume is practically confined to Zeno, Chrysippus, Panaetius, and Posidonius. The problem posed by the conditions of the series has been met by a method which might be described as 'scissors and paste with additions'. Apart from the introduction and notes, the whole book consists of a comprehensive selection of translations from testimonia and fragments arranged and printed to be read continuously. Where necessary, link sentences in italics are inserted to bridge the gap between one fragment and another. Sometimes these link passages extend to a whole paragraph, but usually they are a single sentence or even a few words only. Moreover, a skilful choice and abbreviation of fragments combined with some licence in translation have often enabled a large number of passages to be printed continuously without the intervention of italics. The separate fragments can be distinguished only by reference to the original texts in conjunction with the notes at the end of the book which give the number in Von Arnim for Zeno and Chrysippus, and a direct reference to the ancient source in most cases for Panaetius and Posidonius.

The effect is all rather curious and not entirely satisfactory. Would it not have been wiser either to have followed the plan adopted in the same series for the volume on the Presocratics, and to have offered simply a collection of illustrative passages in translation, or, if this were felt to have been too austere, to have broken right away from the original Latin and Greek for considerable parts of the book? As it is we are offered the bait of a continuous treatment of the Stoics in their own words, but in fact there is imported a good deal of the obscurity of the original texts without any facilities for studying them in a critical manner. It is to be hoped that this method of dealing with philosophical fragments will not be extended. It is, however, only fair to say that, as a *tour de force*, the work has been carried through with great skill, and if it must be done in this way it could hardly have been done better.

The arrangement follows closely that of Pohlenz's larger work (*Die Stoa, Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 2 vols., 1948-9), to which the reader is naturally referred for all discussion. As in that work, Zeno and Chrysippus are treated together, without any real attempt to distinguish their doctrines. Panaetius and Posidonius, taken separately, have over sixty and over ninety pages respectively.

In each case the arrangement is systematic according to doctrines, and each section has a full and adequate cover, though questions involving Stoic polemics are largely omitted. The introduction, which is excellent, suggests that the main purpose of the book is to give to the modern reader an introduction to the depth, variety, and importance of Stoic doctrine; and this purpose is well fulfilled. A protest against viewing the Hellenistic period in philosophy as one of decline is followed by a summary statement of basic doctrines against their social and religious background. It is perhaps a matter for regret that we could not have more in the body of the book of the kind of matter so suggestively handled in the introduction.

University of Manchester

G. B. KERFERD

THEOCRITUS

A. S. F. Gow: *Theocritus*. Edited with a translation and commentary. 2 vols. Vol. I: Introduction, Text, and Translation. Pp. lxxiv+257. Vol. II: Commentary, Appendix, Indexes, and Plates. Pp. 634; 15 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1950. Cloth, £3. 3s. net.

Perhaps the scholar's first reaction on opening this learned and exhaustive edition will be to see in what order the poems are presented; and he will probably breathe a sigh of relief at finding himself back at Stephanus' arrangement. Wilamowitz's attempt to return to the order of the archetype not only caused trouble but was, as we can now see from the second-century papyrus \mathfrak{P}^1 , almost certainly abortive.

Of his translation Mr. Gow says 'it has no higher aim than to show in tolerable English what I understand to be the poet's meaning'. He is too modest: his version abounds in such neat turns as αὐτόφλοιον . . . ἐμμητρον, 'with bark and pith intact'; τοῦτω τὸν κλύμενον κατεφρύγετο τήνον ἔρωτα, 'it was for him, the precious passion that had Cynisca on the grill'. Its clarity is well exemplified in Id. 21 (the catching of the golden fish), and its poetry in Id. 25 (the home-coming of Augeas' herds). Needless to say, Gow's whole translation is in the highest degree accurate; the only places where any doubt might be felt are: 2. 150, αὐτε not translated (? = 'this time'); 5. 142, καχαῶ, 'the laugh I have' (rather 'shall have'); 15. 57, τοὶ δ' ἔβαν ἐς χώραν, 'and they've gone to their place' (this is vague, but Gow suggests in his note that it means 'the starting point in the hippodrome or the place where the competitors waited their turn'). Does it not rather mean 'have got (back) into rank', i.e. the opposite of χώραν λυπεῖν; cf. χώραν λαβεῖν in, for example, Xen. Cyr. iv. 5. 37? They would not have had time to reach the hippodrome); 15. 117, ὄσσα τ' ἀπὸ γλυκερῷ μέλιτος τά τ' ἐν ὕγρῳ ἐλαίῳ (πονέονται), 'and those they make of sweet honey and smooth oil' (rather 'those they make of honey and those they (cook) in oil'); 25. 270, ἐξεράνυσσα, 'could stretch' (rather 'had stretched'). With more hesitation I raise the following points: 2. 151 f., Ἐρωτος . . . ἐπεχείτα, 'his toast was Love'—surely here 'he toasted his love' (the genitive of the person is used at 14. 19, and for ἔρωτος = 'object of love' cf. Alciph. iv. 7. 8 and at 3. 7 ἐρώτυλον); 22. 116, ἐτέρων ὑποφήτης, 'interpreting to others' (a very odd genitive; perhaps the usual rendering 'the mouthpiece of others', i.e. the Muses, is still to be preferred); 24. 137-9, δεῖπνον δὲ κρέα . . . αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄματι τυννὸν . . . δόρπον, 'his evening meal was . . . flesh . . . but through the day . . .

a small repast'. Gow produces good evidence to show that in the third century *δείπνον* was the evening meal and *δάρπνον* could mean simply 'food'. But T. is writing of heroic times when *δείπνον* was luncheon and *δάρπνον* supper. Besides, it is easier to take *ἐπ' ἄμ.* as = 'after the day('s labours)' than 'through the day'); *Ep.* 8. 5, *γλαφυρὰς χερός* certainly could mean 'polished craftsmanship', but it would perhaps be more natural to translate 'finished work of art' (cf. *Herod.* iv. 72; *Poll.* ii. 150 *Πολυκλείτου χεὶρ τὸ ἄγαλμα*).

On the life of T. and the dating of the poems Gow writes fully and clearly. His views are the orthodox ones: i.e. he dates *Id.* 16, which, as he says (p. xvii n. 1), 'is cardinal to all discussion of T.'s life', to 275/4, dismissing almost unnoticed Beloch's theory which would put it some ten years later. He regards the bucolic poems as early and as written in the eastern Mediterranean rather than in Sicily. He sees certain similarities between T.'s *epyllia* and the hymns of Callimachus, but, as he says, these are of little use for dating, as the chronology of Call.'s poems is uncertain, and in any case no one can say which of the two was the original and which the borrower. He thinks that *Id.* 13 and part of *Id.* 22 were written as a counterblast—and therefore subsequently—to the *Argonautica*, and remarks (p. xxiii) that 'if the dates of the latter are ever established some light will be thrown on the chronology of the two *Idylls*'.

The section on the text is lucid, and the table showing 'the whereabouts of the manuscripts, the sigla attached to them by Ziegler, Ahrens, Wilamowitz, and Gallavotti . . . and the dates assigned to the manuscripts by Gallavotti' is invaluable. Gow adds a note on a sixteenth-century manuscript at Salamanca (*Cod. Salmanticensis* 295, which he calls Non.) unknown to Gallavotti. There follows a similar *catalogue raisonnée* of the papyri and parchment fragments and a discussion on the relationship of these to the later, i.e. medieval and renaissance, manuscripts. He shows that *Π*³ (= Pap. Antinoae) descends from a hyparchetype from which also descend K and the Vatican and Laurentian families of manuscripts. (The sporadic excellence of this papyrus is worth noting. I have counted twenty-one places in which its readings support conjectural emendations. But 'sporadic' is not an unfair adjective, for many of *Π*³'s readings are grotesque.) In his section on the early history of the text Gow shows himself sceptical about Wilamowitz's theory of an edition of the bucolic poets (without *Σ*) by Artemidorus and a subsequent edition of T. (with *Σ*) by Theon, arguing that the evidence supplied by the papyri is unfavourable to this hypothesis.

Gow bases his apparatus on that of Gallavotti, disregarding, however, Gall.'s I and T and adding the above-mentioned Non. For the epigrams he has reintroduced C D Cal. Junt., ejected by Gall. as derived from K. His apparatus is considerably simpler than either Wil.'s or Gall.'s, but, as far as I can see, it contains the grain, discarding the chaff. No emendations are mentioned in it save those that are incorporated in the text.

In the next section of the introduction Gow explains and justifies his method of dealing with his text in the matter of dialect. He has ejected dorisms from the three poems 12 (in which he notes *Π*³'s avoidance of them), 22, and 25 written in Epic and Ionic, and has gone 'as far as any of' his 'predecessors in restoring the dialect' to the Aeolic poems 28–31. He follows Gall. in introducing barytonesis¹ and psilosis. As for the Doric *idylls*, genuine, dubious, or spurious,

¹ The Aeolic accentuation of the dative of Sappho, fr. 26 (Lobel) *ταῖ γάμβρωνι*), and Gow the article seems to have been *τῷ* (cf. gives *τῷ πῶδε* at 30. 3. When, however, the

he has been on the whole content to follow Wil., pointing out that there can be no certainty in the text of a poet whose dialect was 'artificial, peculiar to himself, and not consistent even in his own usage'.

The introduction ends with a brief note on the scholia, summarized from Wendel, and on the commentators from Theon to the Byzantine scholars and sciolists.

Gow's conservatism is abundantly apparent. Whether or not this conservatism goes too far is a matter of opinion. In the following places he retains the MS. readings as against Wil. and/or Gall.: 5. 38 καὶ λυκιδεῖς: τοὶ λ. (Meineke) Wil. and Gall.; 5. 52-4, he keeps 53 (secl. Wil. et Gall.); 8. 56 σύννομα μῆλ': σύννομε (Graefe) κάλ' (Meineke) Wil.—this involves his accepting Valckenae's unlikely (<τ>); 13. 23, he keeps the MS. order where Wil. accepts Jacob's transposition; 21. 60 χρυσῶ: χρυσῷ (Ahrens) Wil. and Gall.; 25. 203, Wil. 'versus plane corruptus'. Why? The text adopted by Gow will not do, but Tr's προσναῖον with Edmonds's ἀτλητοπαθεῖντες seems excellent. The following MS. readings kept by both Wil. and Gall. are retained by Gow also, though they seem scarcely defensible: 1. 136 κῆξ ὀρέων (leg. Wedd's ὄρθρων); 2. 141 θερμότερ' ἤς ἢ πρόσθε (? leg. θερμότερον πυρὸς ἦθε, Platt; Σ' ἐπυριάθημεν: cf. Ar. Eq. 382 πυρὸς γ' ἕτερα θερμότερα); 15. 101 χρυσῷ παίζουσ' (? leg. χρυσωπίσδοις, Scaliger); 16. 77 Λιβύας (leg. Λιλύβας, Kuiper; 85 ff. far from showing 'Carthage and not merely the Carthaginians in Sicily to be within T.'s view', seem to me at least to show the opposite—ἐχθροὺς ἐκ νάσοιο . . . πέμψεναν ἀνάγκαι); 23. 55-6 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νεκρῷ / εἵματα πάντ' ἐμίανεν (leg. οὐδ' ἐπὶ . . . κάλ', Meineke); 24. 16, omit with Paley and Hiller—or emend (cf. C.Q. xxi. 203); 25. 27 ἴσασι (leg. ἴσχουσι, Ahrens); 25. 135 ἀγροτεράων (leg. ἀγρομενάων, Edmonds); 27. 60 μείζονα (leg. ἀμείνονα, Cobet).

In nine passages Gow follows Gall. in accepting into his text the readings of P: these are 15. 2 δρίφον, 15. 17 ἱκτο, 15. 33 πεῖ, 15. 50 παίχνια, 15. 67 ἀποπλαγχθῆς, 15. 72 ὄχλος ἀλαθέως, 15. 86 φιληθείς, 15. 145 σοφώτατον, 24. 69 με. From the same source he accepts at 2. 83 οὐκέτι (no improvement on οὐδέ τι), at 2. 138 νῦν (correcting P's μιν, which Gall. prints) for οἱ, at 15. 99 διαχρέμπεται (for vulg. διαθρύπτεται), at 15. 143 Ἰλαος, ὦ (which, despite his parallels for the omission of the verb, seems at least no better than the MS. Ἰλαθι νῦν). He agrees with Gall. in taking Ahrens's excellent οὐδ' ἄτις at 18. 25 (Wil. obelizes), and introduces into his text the following: Denniston's μὲν (MSS. μάν) γε at 3. 37; Meineke's ποκά (MSS. κεν) at 14. 43 (his explanation of this hitherto puzzling line is conclusive); at 21. 17-18 Campbell's παρ' αὐτᾶ / . . . καλύβᾳ (a great improvement on the MS. accusatives); Legrand's εἶλε, with Junt. Cal.'s δείμα, at 21. 53 (the MS. εἶχε is feeble, and σῆμα nonsensical); Meineke's εἶλες (MSS. εὔρες) and Ahrens's ἦν (MSS. ἐν, which destroys any construction) at 21. 64; and at 21. 67 Scaliger's τοῖς = 'your' (MSS. τοι) which gives good sense. At 25. 216 he accepts Hartung's οὐδέπω (? less good than Voss's οὐδέ πῃ (οὐδ' ὅπῃ D)), and at 28. 6 Lobel's ἀντιφληθῆν (cited by Gall. in his app. crit.). If this is right—and we certainly want a passive and not the future active of the manuscripts—then τέρφομαι must be regarded as a short vowel subjunctive. This, unique in T., should have had comment. At 26. 27-8 Gow mentions with approval but does not accept into his text Lobel's Διονύσῳ / ἄμμι μέλοι, which with P's ὅστις ἀπεχθόμενος gives

article is used demonstratively, as at 29. 11, with what authority.

17; 30. 18, 21, Gow has τῷ. One wonders

excellent sense. At 27. 10 he takes Ribbeck's ἔσται· ὁ νῦν for the nonsensical ἐστι καὶ οὐ of the manuscript kept by Wil. and Gall.

Gow's own emendations which find their way into the text are (besides a few dialect changes such as -τραφ- for -τρεφ- at 8. 42 and 11. 40, and ἄκραβος (MSS. -ηβος) at 8. 93); 15. 127 ἄμμιν (MSS. ἄλλα), which, with τὸν μὲν . . . τὰν δ' in 128, referring respectively to Adonis and Aphrodite, together with the postulate of one κλίνα, brilliantly unriddles a very vexed passage; 21. 49 ἀνέλω: this deliberative subj. is certainly preferable to Wil.'s future, ἀνελῶ, and keeps the accent of the manuscripts (μὲν ἔλω); 23. 51 ἐπιάλλε (MSS. ἔβαλλε), but I see no reason in face of the parallel at *Il.* xxiv. 272 to reject Briggs's¹ ἐπέβαλλε in favour of this; 23. 54 αὐλείας (MSS. αὐλᾶς ἐξ), which gives good sense; 30. 5 ὄν<ι>σί μ<ε>; perhaps better than Ahrens's ὄν<ι>ή πάλιν; 30. 13 οὐκέτ' ἴσασθ', which had been anticipated by Schwabe (οὐκέτ' ἴσησθ') and Edmonds (οὐκὶ φίσασθ'). Gow makes four further good suggestions, but confines them to the commentary: 13. 15 εὐκλειῶς (MSS. εὐ ἔλκων); 23. 44 καὶ πρὶν ἵης (MSS. κὰν ἀπίης), which gives the right meaning; 25. 153 *καταυτόθε = 'immediately' (the MSS. καταυτόθι seems meaningless); 29. 20 ἔχων (MSS. ἔχειν); φιλῇ . . . ἔχων = 'go on loving'. (He suggests that the ὑπερανορέων of l. 19 means 'great men', and that the sense of the line is 'you reek of the high and mighty'. But these two lines remain as puzzling as ever.)

There are many difficult passages which Gow elucidates without having recourse to emendation. Perhaps the most important are these: 1. 29 ff. (the cup): he solved this crux as early as 1913 in his article in *J.H.S.* xxxiii by taking ἐλχρυσος as = the flower of the ivy, and seeing that the figure groups were inside the cup. (Both these points are illustrated by plates.) At. 1. 129 he takes χεῖλος as the lip of the *pîpe*; at 5. 90 he regards λείος as = 'good-tempered(ly)'; at 7. 70 he construes αὐταῖς ἐν κυλίκεσσι with μεμυμένους (but this, though an improvement, is hardly a solution); at 7. 112 he imagines Pan on the banks of the Hebrus in the upper part of its course as it still flows west; hence he is τετραμμένος ἐγγύθεν Ἄρκτω. At 8. 49 he takes Wil.'s ἐς (MSS. ὦ) βάθος ὕλας and understands ἴθι, regarding (as did Wil.) αἱ σμῆαι . . . ἔριφοι as a parenthesis. Then, ἐν τήνῳ γὰρ τήνος· ἴθ', ὦ κόλε, . . . This effectively clears up the passage. The erstwhile mysterious μή μοι κενεὰν ἀπομάξης (15. 95) he takes as meaning not 'don't treat me as though I were your slave', which, as he says, would demand ἐμοί, but 'do not level an empty pot', i.e. 'don't waste your time giving me orders which I shall not obey'. At 15. 117 he puts a full stop at the end of the line, taking πετεηνὰ καὶ ἐρπετά (118) not as further shaped cakes, but as *pièces de résistance* for the feast. At 16. 46 he puts a colon at ὀπλοτέροις, remarking justly that 'the popular punctuation with a comma makes τιμᾶς . . . ἀγώνων part of the protasis, and hence the fame of the Thessalians dependent as much on their racing stables as on their employment of Simonides'. (In this he was anticipated by Gall.) At. 25. 127 he takes ἔλικες as = 'black', quoting Hesych. and some Homeric scholia as authorities. Certainly, the other two herds being respectively red and white, this makes good sense. Accepting Legrand's ἦν for MS. ὥς at 25. 164 he regards it as first, not third, person: 'I was but a youth'. This is admirable. Readers may not feel equally convinced by his ingenious theory that at 2. 156 τὰν Δωρίδα . . . ὄλπαν means, in effect, 'his what the

¹ I take the opportunity of apologizing for my ignorance as displayed in *C.Q.* xxi. 204, where I made the same suggestion not

knowing that I had been anticipated by Briggs.

Dorians call *δλπα*, and that at 18. 48 *ἀννείμῃ Δωριστί* means 'may (as the Dorians say) *ἀννείμῃ* (i.e. 'read')'.

The amount of learning that has been put into, and can be extracted from, Gow's exegetical notes is prodigious. See, for example, his introduction to *Id.* 2 for magic, his note on 10. 20 for 'love is blind', on 17. 36 for the touchstone and its use, on 14. 15 for Bibline wine, on 15. 19 and 36 for the prices of wool and cloth in T.'s time, on 15. 34 for women's dress, on 22. 80 for boxing and boxing-gloves, and on 25. 243 for the proper Greek words for the tails of various animals. At 24. 11 is a long note on the exact (astronomical) time at which the snakes attacked the infant Heracles; and at 12. 35 we are given over a page on the meaning of *χαροπός*.

After saying this it seems ungrateful to complain of omissions. Yet there are some. For one thing, where Gow is contented with the MS. reading he seldom suggests that others have not been equally happy; consequently he mentions very few emendations except such as he accepts into his text. It is true that he gives what must be almost a complete catalogue of books and articles (with references) on T., and the reader could by using this find such suggested emendations for himself; but it would be a laborious business, and even if he undertook it he might find a certain amount of chaff with the grain. Gow seems to treat it as all chaff. The following list of suggestions not mentioned in this edition could be lengthened to taste. At 6. 38 Meineke's *λευκοτέρα[v] ἀγνά[v]*, (*ὑποφαίνει* is very odd = 'reflects'); 8. 14 *ἰσομάτορα ἀμνόν*, Fritzsch's view that *ἀμνόν* is an intrusive gloss (for, e.g., *ἔπισσαν*); 8. 74 Cholmeley's *τῶμικρον*, in apposition to the sentence ('I did not answer, to annoy her'), suggested by the Σ; 9. 11 *πρωγοίας ἀπο* (MSS. *ἀπό*), with *ἀπ'* *ἄκρας* in l. 10; of *ἀπάσας* Gow remarks 'the word seems pointless' (cf. *C.Q.* xxiv. 31); 9. 34 Heinsius's *ἐργατινας* for the odd *ἐξαπίνας* of the manuscripts (a good parallel to *μελίσσας*); 13. 10 <'s> *μέσον*: Gow admits that *ὄροισι* is 'strange of noon' (cf. *C.Q.* xxiv. 32); 13. 52 Edmonds's *ωδρος* for MS. *οὔρος* (the article is almost necessary); 16. 98 Graefe's *ἐνδι' ἄγεσκον* for MS. *ἐνδιάσσκον* (uniquely transitive here); 25. 274-5 Dittrich's (ap. Gall.) interchange of *σιδήρω* and *μὲν ὤλη*.

I add a few odd notes. 6. 22 Gow accepts Heinsius's *ποθορόμμι* (MSS. *ποθορόμαι*). This seems to have been the reading of Σ, who explain *ἐν ᾧ νῦν ὁρῶ καὶ εἴη μοι μέχρι τέλους ὁρᾶν* (I do not understand Wil.'s note: 'indicativum legit Σ'). 7. 46 Gow takes *Ὠρομέδων* = Mt. Dikeo in Cos. The notion that he was a giant (Σ) may arise from the fact that according to Hesiod (*Theog.* 129) not only giants but also mountains are called the children of *Γαῖα*. 14. 22 *λύκον εἶδες*;—but the whole point is the wolf's seeing the victim first. Should we not read *λύκος εἶδέ σ'*;? 15. 103 *μαλακαὶ πόδας*—despite *πόδας ὠκύς* the accusative seems odd and one would expect a dative, cf. 22. 194 *ἀκριβὴς ὄμμασι*. Why not keep *μαλακαίποδες*? For the form cf. *μεισιπόλιος* (*Il.* xiii 361; cf. *K.B.G.* i. ii. 329). 16. 6 for *Χάριτες* in the sense of (?) anthology or the like cf. the *Χάριτες* of Aratus (Susemihl, i, p. 292, n. 34). 16. 60 for *μετρεῖν* = *ἀριθμεῖν* cf. Alc. fr. 182 (Lobel) *μετρησάι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀριθμῆσαι Ἀλκαῖος*. At 22. 170 I do not see any need to postulate a lacuna, though Gow has the authority of Wil. and Gall. in doing so. It would be a small change to read *έός* (= 'thy' as at 17. 50 and ?10. 2) in 173, and take the v.l. *Κάστωρ* in 175. Lynceus might say, perhaps judging by appearance, that Castor was younger than Polydeuces; but could Castor say this of his twin? Nor do I see much difficulty at 178 in supposing *ἄλλοι* (= *οἱ ἕτεροι*, as *τὸν ἄλλον* = *τὸν ἕτερον* at l. 205) means 'the

two survivors'. In 23. 61 to whom does *παῖδός* refer? Apparently to the dead boy (so Hiller); but even in this silly poem such a post-mortem repentance is incredible. Could it be taken as = the avenging boy-god, Eros? That would be odd, but perhaps not so odd. A note would have been welcome. 24. 113 *πρηνεοῦντες*: for this trick of the pancratium see *Σ* Pind. *I.* 4. 52. The statement of Callierges that the beginning of Id. 25 is defective, though now supported by the evidence of *Π*³, is, I think strangely, rejected by Gow.

The only mistakes I have noticed are: 6. 20 *ἐν* should be *ἐπὶ* (cf. Chandler, § 910); and in the note on 7. 109 (ii, p. 158) for 'Gildersleeve *M.T.*' read 'Gildersleeve ap. Goodwin *M.T.*'.

Mr. Gow has kept the small world of scholarship waiting a long time for his Theocritus; but now that it has come its amplitude and quality show the unreasonableness of our impatience.

Brasenose College, Oxford

M. PLATNAUER

ONESICRITUS

TRUEDELL S. BROWN: *Onesicritus: A Study in Hellenistic Historiography*. Pp. viii+196. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949. Cloth, \$3.00.

THIS book treats of Onesicritus in five chapters: (i) The life and work of O., (ii) O. and the Cynics, (iii) O. and the Utopian literature, (iv) O. as a natural scientist, (v) O., Nearchus, and the voyage back from India. It concludes with two short appendixes about Diogenes of Sinope. It is well written, and the author is not concerned to make of Onesicritus a figure more interesting, more likeable, or more important than is warranted by a reasonable and impartial inspection of the evidence. Thus in chap. v he is extremely fair-minded as between O. and Nearchus: in a comparison of the two men as writers the advantage inevitably rests with Nearchus, and this Dr. Brown admits, merely suggesting parenthetically that Nearchus was perhaps not in every way so straightforward a character as is commonly supposed. In this I agree with him.

The problem of the composition of O.'s work *Πῶς Ἀλέξανδρος ἤχθη* is complicated for Dr. Brown by his assumption that the anecdote of O.'s reading of (or from) his Book IV to Lysimachus at a date later than 305 B.C. ought to mean that Book IV cannot have been written much earlier than the date of the reading. This is a difficult position to take up, particularly for one who (like Dr. Brown) believes that Clitarchus wrote early (about 310?), for it seems most probable that Clitarchus used Onesicritus. But neither from the internal evidence of the anecdote itself nor from any external consideration is it necessary to think that O. on this occasion was reading to Lysimachus what he had only recently written: this was seen by Dr. Jacoby. This difficulty apart, and subject to the difficulties of the evidence, Dr. Brown deals satisfactorily with O.'s life and work, showing (what is not indeed a novelty) that his book was not a history but an encomium, coloured (but not consistently) by Cynic influences, and conforming to a practice then becoming fashionable of introducing Utopian digression (O.'s particular Utopia being the land of Musicanus). A sufficiently terrifying combination for anyone

interested in *history*: O. himself was not. Perhaps it is not unfair to suggest that it is this combination, together with O.'s notorious sensationalism (*τῶν παραδόξων ἀρχικυβερνήτην*), that is responsible for the paradox, noticed of course by Dr. Brown but not explained by him, that a work of this title should almost never have been cited by later writers for anything to do with Alexander himself: many Greek historians were uncritical in their use of sources, but they drew the line perhaps at using for something really important a writer who was sheerly irresponsible.

For irresponsibility seems to have been the keynote of O.'s work. Dr. Brown writes (p. 61) that the experiment in Utopianism gives O. 'a place in the development of the romance literature of the Greeks', and he illustrates the view by a comparison with the experiments of Plato and Theopompus, Euhemerus and Iambulus. But he fails to point out that the place which is given to O. is no enviable one: for O. is alone in having introduced 'Utopia' without warning into a book concerned with descriptions of actual places and actual contemporary people—surely a literary and historical monstrosity? Equally irresponsible in its way was the description of a notable voyage of exploration which neither named the stopping-places nor recorded the day's progress. And no one will be surprised that Dr. Brown in his chapter on 'O. as a natural scientist' can find little good to say of such a man: as an observer he was (at the best) mediocre, and he was 'not trained to think scientifically' (p. 102). The well-known story of O. and Nearchus and Cape Maceta (Arrian, *Indica* 32. 8 ff.) exemplifies—if it is true—O.'s irresponsibility this time not in letters but in life. For other examples (in the writings) see, for example, pp. 53, 88, 95 of this book.

The one aspect, perhaps, of his author that Dr. Brown does not examine exhaustively is his profession. Whatever the actual rank or appointment of O. may have been in Alexander's navy in India (the question is discussed, pp. 8 f.), he was clearly in some sense its senior pilot or navigator: and since there is no evidence (so far as I know) that the *κυβερνήτης* was ever a mere figurehead whose duties could be performed by a deputy who knew the job, it follows that O. must have been a professional navigator for many years, and must have spent much of his life at sea (what else could have earned him his distinguished position in the fleet?). It may be therefore that he is seen in true perspective as primarily a man of the sea and only secondarily a man of letters. This in itself need not make anyone think the less of him as a man of letters (who values Ptolemy's history the less because he was a king before he was an historian?); but it does suggest, when it is taken together with the known characteristics of O.'s book, that perhaps he was not a writer to be taken seriously at all, in the sense that one should expect to find in him any steady or coherent purpose or view of life rooted in any profound intellectual background. It is possible that he was an adventurer and an opportunist, who gave his public what he thought it wanted. The queen of the Amazons and the wonders of the East—clearly there was a public for this stuff. Utopias were the fashion, and Cynics could be trusted to get a crowd round: both these ingredients could be useful to a writer who aimed merely at entertaining. It is in this sense only that one wonders whether Dr. Brown, for all his careful judgement and impartiality, may not have overrated his author's significance.

However that may be, it is difficult not to regret that Onesicritus, when it was open to him by reason of his opportunities (and perhaps even his talents)

to have written a good book of history or travel or (best of all) navigation, chose to write instead, if the extant fragments are a guide, mostly piffle. Dr. Brown, I would suggest, deserves a better 'hero' next time.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

G. T. GRIFFITH

LATIN LITERATURE

ETTORE PARATORE: *Storia della Letteratura Latina*. Pp. 991; 9 plates. Florence: Sansoni, 1950. Paper, L. 1400.

THERE are two kinds of history of Latin literature—that which one consults for detailed information, and that which one reads rather for the synthesis which it presents and the point of view from which it presents it. Germany has provided the intellectual climate most favourable to the former kind, from Fabricius through Bernhardt and Teuffel to the Schanz-Hosius-Krüger of our own day. In recent years Italian scholars have distinguished themselves in the second sphere; the names of Bignone, Rostagni, and Amatucci spring to the mind.

It is to this Italian tradition that, despite its Teutonic bulk, Professor Paratore's book belongs. Indeed, it would be very difficult to use it as a work of reference at all; it has no index, no running titles, no paragraph headings. And although he is evidently familiar with most of the 'Literatur', and often alludes to it, he never gives a reference, and scarcely ever mentions a scholar by name.

Judged by the appropriate standards, it is a curiously uneven work. For instance, Paratore is well aware that the role a writer plays in the political life of his own age is important for the understanding and judgement of his work. Accordingly he gives us a detailed, and on the whole, just survey of Cicero's activity as a statesman and of his shifting party allegiance. And in discussing the Augustan age he tries to analyse and illustrate in a realistic way the political tendencies of its men of letters: the treatment of Asinius Pollio is a specially good example of this, though perhaps it overestimates Pollio's importance. Sometimes, indeed, his anxiety to give political interpretations lead him into superficial and mechanical modernization, as when he speaks of the Flavians as representatives of the petty *bourgeoisie* (p. 529). Then when we turn to the section on Caesar, what do we find? He is depicted as a benevolent superman, the objectivity of his autobiographical works is unquestioned, he is the paladin of *romanità*, hostile and immune to all influences from the Hellenistic East. The whole thing is an uncritical hymn of praise, of the type fashionable in Italy under Fascism.

Again, Paratore realizes that Roman literature, like the rest of Roman culture, grew and developed in a world where Greek was the principal language of civilization, that it was always in a sense derivative, and that to understand how Roman writers worked we must always have our eye on the Greek literary tradition in which they were educated. Yet in discussing Roman historians, in particular Sallust and Livy, he makes no attempt to place them against the background of Hellenistic historiography, without which we can have only a one-sided view of their work. And in the 150 pages devoted to early Roman literature he does not squarely face the problem of the relation—which of course changed from generation to generation—between the works of these

pioneers and their Greek models. Livius Andronicus, it is implied, chose freely on aesthetic grounds to imitate or adapt this or that kind of Greek drama. Why and how Greek drama was adopted just at this time as a part of Roman official celebrations is a question never asked, let alone answered. In the sections on Plautus and Terence we are left in the dark about the occasion and *mise en scène* of Roman dramatic performances, and hence about just what the Roman playwright did with his Greek model. In the section on Ennius, the poet's imitation of Homer, his ambition to be a second Homer, is discussed most interestingly, but the approach is too general. The detailed way in which Homeric motifs and Homeric phrases helped to mould the cast of his thought and language is hardly examined, although its effect on subsequent Latin literature was immense.

Part of the reason for this is that Paratore does not presuppose a knowledge of Latin in his readers, and so is precluded from getting to grips with actual passages of the texts he is discussing. It is perhaps the feeling thus engendered of being at one remove from the object that makes much of his literary criticism seem a little woolly and subjective. Too often the reader is entertained to speculation on the state of mind of this or that author without a close and critical examination of what he had to say and how he said it.

To those, however, who can supply this essential background from their own resources, much in this book is highly stimulating, even if not always acceptable. The section on the Scipionic circle and Cato is excellent, though perhaps a little vague about the realities behind the famous 'mixed constitution'. We find, too, keen and sympathetic appreciation of Lucretius' poetry. But is it right to maintain that the poet was filled with a profound pessimism? For instance, v. 195-234 is quoted as a confession of the vanity of human life (pp. 275-6). But surely it is merely the answer to a quite specific argument for the providential government of the universe (cf., for instance, Cic. *N.D.* ii. 133 ff., 154 ff.). The Epicureans believed in no such providential government, but they did preserve in some of their thought—and Lucretius was no stranger to it—that sense of human progress which fifth-century Athens knew, and which we find, for instance, in Thucydides' *Archaeology*, in Aeschylus' *Prometheus*, in Sophocles' *Antigone*,¹ in Euripides' *Supplikes*,² and elsewhere.

Perhaps his best passages are that on the gradual exhaustion of the literary tradition, and the series of revolts against it in the first and second centuries of our era (pp. 673 ff.), and his long and interesting discussion of the decline of the Western Empire, the growth and influence of Christianity, and the reflection in literature of this complex process (pp. 799-818). Yet even here, for all that is good in detail, we are left with a rather unsatisfactory set of separate explanations: the incursions of the barbarians, the growth of the colonate, depopulation, the growing influence of orientals, and finally—a phrase that many English readers will recognize—'la perdita di fiducia in se stessa . . . come avviene sempre in tutte le civiltà più evolute' (p. 809). Lucretius might have thought Professor Paratore a pessimist.

¹ Cf. particularly the famous choral ode, ll. 332-75:

πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κούδεν ἀν-
θρώπου δεινότερον πέλει κτλ.

² Cf. particularly Theseus' speech, ll. 196-218:

ἔλεξε γάρ τις ὡς τὰ χείρονα
πλείω βροτοῖσιν ἐστι τῶν ἀμεινόνων·
ἐγὼ δὲ τούτους ἀντίαν γνώμην ἔχω κτλ.

Throughout the book there are statements open to the gravest doubt, of which the following are a selection: *fecit* is not derived from the Praenestine form *fhefhaked* (p. 8); 'la fertilità metrica e musicale del teatro etrusco' (p. 13) surely implies assumptions which few would grant without question; 'fatio Metelli Romae fiunt consules' is probably not a saturnian, and Caesius Bassus certainly does not say it is one (p. 31); Paratore speaks of three types of mime, 'recitato', 'cantato', and 'danzato', a formulation which confuses mime and pantomime¹ (p. 237); Modern Persian *Shāh* has nothing to do with Latin *Caesar* (p. 264); it is hardly enough to state as a fact that the reason for Ovid's banishment was that he wrote poems compromising Augustus' moral reforms (p. 349); Pliny the Elder does not say that Catullus translated poems of Theocritus² (p. 367); few modern scholars would agree that Ovid really wrote a poem in Getic (p. 498); the suggestion that Petronius' celebrated posthumous letter to Nero is merely Tacitus' cryptic way of referring to the *Satyricon* is absurd and should not be revived (p. 616); Orestes, the father of the Western Emperor Romulus Augustulus, though a friend of Attila, was in no sense a barbarian³ (p. 804); Synesius of Cyrene was not so uncompromising a Christian that his admiration for Hypatia need surprise anyone (p. 808); Iulius Valerius had actually very little influence on the spread of the Alexander Romance in the West⁴ (p. 862); the first and greatest interference by the Huns with St. Jerome in his retreat was not in 402 but in 395 (*Ep.* 60. 16, 77. 8), when the saint chartered a ship to evacuate his pious Roman ladies from the Holy Land (p. 916); Rutilius' return to his native land is usually dated in 416 and not in 417 (p. 951).

It is not for a foreign reviewer to pass judgement on Paratore's Italian style. But one cannot help noticing an exuberance of expression which does not make for easy reading. For instance, on p. 60 two successive sentences are of 191 and 224 words respectively, and they are followed on the next page by a sentence of 251 words.

It is hard to do justice to a long book in a short review, and I am conscious that I have given more attention to the shortcomings of the work than to its merits. Much of it is interesting, much worth re-reading. Yet to those who know little of Latin literature—and it is to such above all that he seems to address himself—Paratore will prove a capricious and confusing guide. This is a pity, for the good bits show how much better the rest could be. There are signs that the book was written in a hurry. Let us hope that the author will have the leisure to revise it, indeed to rewrite it, and his publishers the goodwill to give us in due course not a reprint but a second edition.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

¹ The distinction is perhaps most clearly and succinctly stated in G. J. Theodorides, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Prosa-theaters im IV. und V. Jahrhundert* (Λαογραφία Παράσημα 3), Salonica, 1940, p. 10.

² What he says is: 'hinc (from the general belief in the efficacy of *dirae deprecationes*) Theocriti apud Graecos, Catulli apud nos proximeque Vergilii incantamentorum amatoria imitatio' (*N.H.* xxviii. 19).

³ He was a Roman from Pannonia, the son of one Tatulus. Cf. O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vi. 377; E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches*, 585–6, and sources there quoted.

⁴ The main vehicle through which the Romance became known in the West was the version made by the Archipresbyter Leo of Naples about 960 from a manuscript brought from Constantinople.

NAEVIUS

ENZO V. MARMORALE: *Naevius poeta*, Introduzione biobibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento. Seconda edizione. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, viii.) Pp. 268. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1950. Paper, L. 1300.

MARMORALE's *Naevius* appeared first in 1945 but remained practically unknown outside Italy. This, the second edition, improved in some detail, and somewhat different in shape and layout, but in substance unchanged, deserves special notice since it would be a real boon to the latinist to have all the fragments of *Naevius* united in a reliable critical and annotated edition.

Literary criticism in the narrow sense can, as Marmorale rightly states, find little scope in these scanty remains. The commentator is restricted to elucidating as far as possible the biographical and historical background of the poet's work and explaining the individual fragments. To the first task he addresses himself with unrelenting energy. His judgement, however, is not very sound.

Where was *Naevius* born? A. Gellius says that the epigram which he wrote for himself was full of *superbia Campana*. At Capua, then, in all probability. For, as Leo put it, Capua, and not Cales or Suessa, was the home of *Campana superbia*. Thus J. Heurgon (see below) p. 385 with no more ado calls him a Capuan. Marmorale believes that he can improve on this: 'Gellius' statement goes back to Varro' (this premiss is not altogether safe; see E. Fraenkel, *Gnomon*, ix, 1933, p. 505), 'and in Varro's time *Campanus* meant Capuan, not Campanian'. Marmorale will not allow the wider meaning of the word even in Livy xxvi. 34. 8 'qui nec Capuae nec in urbe Campana quae a populo Romano defecisset per bellum fuissent': 'Livy here reports a *plebei scitum*; therefore *nec Capuae nec in urbe Campana* is a tautology'. It is obviously nothing of the sort, and since Livy undoubtedly follows the text of a S.C. (not a P.S.) of 210 B.C. the chances are that *Campanus* in the sense of Campanian was used in the third century B.C.

When was *Naevius* born? He served in the First Punic War, and his birth, taking into account his death in 201 B.C., may therefore be placed anywhere between, say, 280 and 261, though the upper limit is probably too high. Marmorale is not content with this. A fragment of the *Bellum Poenicum* (19 Mor.) is now widely believed to be a description of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum (H. Fränkel), and it is further assumed that it was the representation of the fall of Troy on the west front of the temple which gave rise to the insertion of the Aeneas story in the account of the Punic War (Strzelecki). *Naevius*, he argues, must have been profoundly impressed by the temple. Now Diodorus tells us that, when Agrigentum was taken by Carthalo in 254 B.C., the surviving citizens took refuge there. Marmorale infers that a Roman garrison (of which Diodorus says nothing) defended itself in the temple, that *Naevius* was a member of that garrison, and that this was the occasion when the temple made that indelible impression on him. If, then, he was serving in 254 B.C. he cannot have been born after 275 B.C. To Marmorale it seems 'difficult to deny' that *Naevius* belonged to that garrison. In case we should be sceptical

¹ Similarly H. T. Rowell, 'The "Campanian" Origin of Cn. Naevius' *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome*, xix (1949), 17 ff., who, though he quotes Marmorale's first edition, does not

seem to be aware of having been anticipated. (I depend for this statement on Marmorale, p. 3 n. 11.)

he adds another *terminus ante*: Fr. 45 Mor. *superbiter, contemptim conerit legiones* may refer to P. Claudius Pulcher (cons. 249) and his harsh and haughty treatment of the troops. Cichorius, who gave this interpretation, added that Naevius might well have served under Claudius. To Marmorale the indignation ringing from the fragment proves this to be a fact, and Naevius was thus born not after 270 B.C.

He is anxious to secure an early date of birth because he would like to establish that the *Bellum Poenicum*, composed according to Cicero in Naevius' old age, was published before 206 B.C. In that year, he suggests, an unknown wit extracted from the poem the line *fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules*, which was written in praise of L. Caecilius Metellus (cons. 251), and circulated it, with the poet's acquiescence as an attack on the consul Q. Caecilius Metellus. This was made possible by the ambiguity of *fato*, an ambiguity neatly echoed in the reply of the Metelli, *malum dabunt Metelli Naevio poetae*, where we are to understand both *mālum* and *mālum* (Buccicarelli).¹ Now Naevius was imprisoned 'ob assiduam maledicentiam et probra in principes civitatis de Graecorum potatarum more dicta', i.e. on account of attacks made from the stage. Having 'proved', with the help of Cicero, *Rep.* iv. 11 (a passage from which no such thing can possibly be inferred), that N. never attacked *ὀνομαστὶ* from the stage, and that the line against the Metelli is a Saturnian from the *B.P.*, he denies that Naevius was imprisoned because of the attack on the Metelli (i.e. in 206 B.C.). And thus the way is free for a theory, set forth with admirable learning and ingenuity, according to which he was imprisoned by Q. Caecilius Metellus, stooge of the Scipionic party, for the attack on Scipio which is preserved by A. Gellius, although, of course, Metellus was at the same time taking his revenge for the attack on himself.

It is a pity that he should have been so blinded by his theories that he throws away one of the few reasonably certain facts. We know that Naevius was imprisoned for attacks from the stage; we are told that the Metelli had something to do with his exile; and we have a line attacking the Metelli. If that line were unmetrical we should have to try to restore scenic metre. In fact, however, the line is a perfect iambic senarius. Marmorale holds that it is a Saturnian. This was a common view before Leo settled the matter in 1905; since then it has been held only by one or two Rip van Winkles. Unable to produce another Saturnian which would scan as a senarius, Marmorale refers us to the fact that one of Naevius' and three of Livius' Saturnians can be scanned as hexameters: those of Livius, of course, are no Saturnians but fragments of the later dactylic version of the *Odyssey*, from which the original version is sometimes distinguished as *Odyssea vetus*.² For the lame second half of his line he has managed to find one parallel, which is of doubtful reading.³ As to the first half he affirms that *fato Metelli Romae* is a normal Saturnian colon. This is very strange, since on the previous page (64) he refers to Leo's discussion of this line (*Saturn. Vers.* p. 32), where it is established that this type of the Saturnian colon in Livius and Naevius invariably has a diaeresis after the second rise. A senarius the line thus remains, and anything not consistent with this fact is wrong.

¹ *Boll. di Fil. Class.* xvii (1907), 35-7. I do not know this paper and can only surmise that Buccicarelli's unfortunate idea was prompted by Plautus, *Amph.* 723.

² See on this point the excellent paper of

S. Timpanaro, *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa*, 1949, pp. 186 ff.

³ I disregard his second 'parallel', which has a short first fall (cf. Leo, cited below, p. 55) and a diaeresis after the second rise.

Marmorale is very well informed, and his views are by no means always as fanciful or mistaken as the examples given might suggest. I am glad to see accepted without hesitation Leo's contention that the reply of the Metelli was a *pasquillo* proper, proved to the hilt as it was by E. Fraenkel's observations on the meaning of *proponere*. I like Marmorale's explanation, following De Sarlo, of the procedure by which Naevius could have been imprisoned. I am much impressed by his attempt, following F. Marx, to show that he was freed through the intervention of M. Claudius Marcellus. And it is a pleasure to see the traditional dating of Plautus' *Miles* effectively defended, though one could hardly have thought that it needed twelve pages to refute the ludicrous arguments adduced in favour of a date in 190 B.C. But the greatest merit of his *saggio* unquestionably is that he has managed to combine with a lively account of Naevius and his political background an exhaustive survey of the scattered literature on the subject. The political background is overdrawn (who would believe that the disrespectful joke about the misdemeanours of the youthful Scipio is a shrewdly timed political blow?), and at least one important work is overlooked, which would have saved some unnecessary argument on the Roman citizenship of the Capuans: J. Heurgon, *Recherches sur l'histoire de Capoue préromaine*, Paris, 1942. But I for one shall use the *saggio* with gratitude, tempered by irritation.

Perhaps it would have been better if in editing the text Marmorale had sought the collaboration of a specialist. Not all lines suffer as badly as *Trag.* 55 R, where the novel form *confrangebant* is introduced by conjecture, with the result that the line has no caesura and makes no sense. But I think it can be stated in fairness that his linguistic and metrical equipment is not equal to the task. For the former see, for example, the impossible translation of *hanc*, *Com.* 74 R, or of *nata est sponsa*, *ibid.* 125; for the latter the split anapaest *ibid.* 137 and the comment on *ibid.* 111; and for both the spondee *deput*, *ibid.* 134.¹ This fragment, which comes from Osborn's Glossary, should have been marked spurious (Goetz, *Ber. Sächs. Ges.* 55 (1903) p. 145; Lindsay, *Gloss Lat.* iv. 180). The same applies to *ibid.* 119. It would appear that he is not sufficiently familiar with earlier work on the text. In the only fragment of the *Lupus* he prints *rex Veiens*, with Ribbeck (*vel veiens* MSS.), overlooking K. Meister (*Lat.-griech. Eigennamen*, Leipzig, 1916, pp. 76 ff.), who recognized in *vel* the name *Vel*. Ribbeck's *signat* is passed over in *Com.* 79 R; and Leo, *Anal. Plaut.* ii (1898), p. 9, n. 1, would have suggested a different treatment of *ibid.* 121 (cf. also Leo p. 29 on *obsitu*, *Trag.* 23 R.). These may be minor blemishes. More damaging is the fact that the apparatus is not reliable. *Com.* 50 R is printed as a senarius: *quod de opsonio stilo mihi pupugit in manum*. Whatever one may think of this as a piece of Latin, or of the translation offered: 'because he pricked my hand with the beak of a (sword) fish which he had bought', it is a serious matter that, though he comments on the supposed synzesis of *opsonio*, he does not tell us that the peculiar *senarius* is purely conjectural, the manuscript reading being *stilo mi in manum pupugit*. *Tarent.* xv R appears as *pallucidum* (so also Ribbeck), with the unsatisfactory comment '= *pellucidum* (*perlucidum*) "diafano"'. We are not informed that *pallucidum* is a conjecture (Klussmann; *pacui dum* Varro), of which Goetz-Schöll justly say: *Ribbeckio placuisse miramur*.

¹ I gather up a few more points of this sort: *Com.* 49 R *capèrrata* not *caperata*; 88 *cām* *eo*: not an irregular hiatus but a perfectly

normal scansion; 93 *patres*: certainly not = *patres conscripti*; 116 *persibus* not *persibus*.

So much for the dramatic fragments. The *B.P.* has fared better because Marmorale could here rely on the edition of Morel, on which he was able to improve by incorporating the results of the work of Strzelecki. I gladly take this opportunity to state that for many years now I have regretted my refusal (*C.R.* 1, 1936, p. 149) to accept Strzelecki's conservative treatment of the book numbers. The commentary, which makes full use of Cichorius' brilliant interpretations, is very helpful but not altogether free from errors. There is a remarkable deduction, from fr. 19 Mor. *supparus* (Festus, p. 310 M.), and from Paul. Fest. p. 311 M. '*supparus vestimentum puellare lineum . . . Afranius: puella non sum, supparo si induta sum?*', that a son of Aeneas made an appearance at the Court of Carthage. If anything follows it is that Marmorale has mistaken *puellaris* for *puerilis*.

Finally, like every editor of Naevius, except Bothe (*Poet. Sc. Lat.*, 1821) and Klusmann (1843), Marmorale has omitted Varro *L.L.* 7. 7 G.-S.: '*id est, ut ait Naevius, "hemisphaerium ubi concha caerulea septum stat"*' (cf. the appendix of Goetz-Schöhl, p. 271). That is a pity. The line is interesting on account both of its subject-matter and of its metrical form.

University College, London

O. SKUTSCH

LUCRETIIUS IN ENGLISH HEXAMETERS

Lucretius: *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by W. HANNAFORD BROWN. Pp. xxii + 262. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1950. Cloth, \$5.

THIS translation of Lucretius by a retired English public schoolmaster seems intended mainly for non-latinists. Books are divided into numbered sections without headings, but lines are not numbered and all reference to the text (clearly Munro's) is omitted. The lacuna after i. 1093 should at least be indicated, since §§ 30 *fin.* and 31 *init.* (p. 40) now lack construction without apparent reason. The Introduction sketches early atomism and its links with modern science. It also proclaims the translator's belief that Lucretius 'will be most intelligibly expressed' if rendered not into prose or any commonly used English metre but into 'rhythmical periods which throw across to us line-by-line, as nearly as may be, the corresponding poetical periods of the Latin text. . . . The most obvious medium would seem to be the measure which Lucretius himself used. It is the English hexameter which can best preserve for us the shape in which the atomic theory crystallized in the mind of the Roman, by reproducing the movement and idiosyncracies of his exposition in its style and by its devices' (pp. xv-xvi). One could draw dangerous conclusions from such words, since metrical problems are nowhere discussed. English accentual hexameters, with slight conventional metrical stress, may not appeal to all as either an obvious or an infallible medium for this 'experiment'. Consider only the familiar difficulty of English monosyllables, and the contrast with Lucretian lines is often strong, especially in some verse-endings;

Nor at a far greater rate than now did those races of mortals
Leave the sweet light of ebbing life. True, this one or that one
Would be more like to be snatched away and, torn by their teeth, would
Furnish the beasts with living food . . . (v. 988 ff.)

Yet such lines have their place:

Shall it be fire? Or water? Or air? Which of these, think you? Any?
Blood, then? Or bones? . . . (i. 853)

The translation is compact and remarkably faithful to the original:

But since thou ever art longing for that which thou lackest, and scornest
That which is ready at hand, therefore life has slipped through thy fingers
Sterile and incomplete, and ere thou could'st ponder the matter,
Death at thy pillow has taken his stand, before thou hadst time to
Feast to the full on the pleasures of life ere taking departure. (iii. 957 ff.)

There are, inevitably, prosaic stretches; but the translator's level rises with increasing majesty in the Latin; e.g.

Firstly; the waked wind's force whips up the waves of the ocean,
Hurls great ships to destruction, and speeds the scurrying rain-clouds:
Yet again, whelming the plains with the tempest's tearing tornado,
Strews them with mighty tree-trunks, and makes the mountain-tops tremble . . .
(i. 271 ff.)

Accuracy is generally high, but Lucretius' 'note' on *corpora* (i. 483-4) is confusingly rendered 'Bodies, then, partly consist of primary atoms of matter, Partly of things which result from aggregations of atoms'; so too *quae* (i. 58) 'Things'—apparently from *res* in 56. There are occasional instances of word-play ('the outstanding feature of body | Namely, to stand in the way . . . ' i. 336-7; 'almost too light to alight . . . ' iii. 387), of verbal repetition, and internal rhyme; certain sporadic linguistic rarities ('whelm', 'manage', *abb.*; 'monstruous', 'terrifical', 'clewed', 'dissemined', 'it skills', for example) seem artificial and not of the fibre of the poem.

Prose-translators of Lucretius doubtless sometimes murmur *suave e terra*. Despite many soundings in the past, English hexameters still offer a hazardous and exploratory voyage. *Hinc insidiosa blandimenta aurium, hinc naufragia*. But the scholar who intends 'no monopoly, but a community in learning' rightly undertakes such a venture.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK

SYMBOLISM IN THE *AENEID*

VIKTOR PÖSCHL: *Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Äneis*. Pp. 288. Innsbruck: Margarete Friedrich Rohrer, 1950. Cloth, \$2.50.

THIS new study of the *Aeneid* has as its purpose to examine the way in which the main themes of the poem and the characters and fates of its chief figures are expressed symbolically, through descriptions, similes, and so on. To its author the characteristic feature of Virgil's poetry is the intimate connexion between form and content, and the manner in which the outer events reflect the emotions of the characters and the tone of the episode or of the work as a whole.

More than once Pöschl refers to a remark of Goethe that in drama each scene should symbolically represent the whole, and applying this principle to the opening of Book I he sees in it a kind of overture introducing the main themes of the poem. The fundamental idea of the *Aeneid* is the opposition between order and *das Dämonische*, and the taming of the latter; this is repre-

sented in the opposition between the strong and calm Jupiter and the passionate Juno, between Aeneas on the one hand and, on the other, Dido and Turnus, the defeated embodiments of the demonic. So in the opening scenes we find a constant recurrence of the idea of taming: the imprisonment of the winds by Aeolus, their suppression by Neptune, the bearing of Aeneas (an inner victory over the blows of fate), the binding of *furor impius* by Augustus, and finally the power of Jupiter himself.

This interpretation is not perhaps entirely satisfactory. It suggests a kind of dualism which is alien to Virgil. On the heavenly plane there is not a clear opposition between Juno and Jupiter; there is also Venus, who is ignored by Pöschl. On the human plane Turnus, inspired by the fury Allecto, may be plausibly thought of as an embodiment of the demonic, but the idea does not seem so appropriate to Dido. When we turn to the chapter on Dido we find that, according to Pöschl's interpretation, the fight with the demonic force takes place in her own soul, and, if I understand him aright, the victory is her suicide, by which she recovers her true self. Yet Virgil's description of Dido ascending the pyre *coeptis immanibus effera* and *furibunda* suggests that he regarded her death as the climax of her *furor*. There is certainly greatness in her end, but it is hardly the greatness of the serene spirit of order which tames the demonic force of the passions.

In his treatment of Aeneas Pöschl is inclined to reject Heinze's theory of a development of character, though he allows that Aeneas' stature grows and that he becomes more mature as the action progresses. He minimizes Aeneas' weaknesses in the earlier part of the poem, and in the Dido episode sees only his strong points. 'With the gradual unfolding of his mission,' he writes, 'his inner certainty increases.' But Aeneas was surely well aware of his mission when he arrived in Africa, and there could have been no doubt of it after Mercury's message; yet in Book V he can still contemplate remaining in Sicily *oblitus fatorum*. Pöschl refers to this episode only to show that Aeneas' relation to fate is not always the Stoic one. This is true so far as it goes, but would it not explain Aeneas more satisfactorily to allow that he develops, not towards the ideal of the Stoic *sapiens*—for, as Pöschl rightly points out, he remains the feeling and suffering man throughout—but towards a Stoic harmony with fate?

In his treatment of particular passages Pöschl is sympathetic and sensitive, alive to all the nuances of a simile or a descriptive passage. His interpretations are not susceptible of proof—we are here in the realm of taste and feeling; but, drawn as they are from the context, they are at least to the point. Occasionally one feels that the method involves some ignoring of relevant considerations. The song of Iopas in Book I is connected with the unhappy love of Dido and Aeneas; the wandering moon and the sun's labours are symbolic of the two lovers and their troubles, *quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles* of Dido's longing, and so on. Pöschl does not mention that the lines occur in an only slightly different form in the *Georgics*, a fact which suggests some doubts as to his interpretation.

These are some of the points in the book that seem open to criticism. There is much, however, that is suggestive and illuminating. Pöschl expresses the hope that his work will help to overcome the old German prejudice against Virgil and restore him to a firm place in German culture. Representing something of a reaction from traditional German scholarship to a more aesthetic

approach, it should have a wide appeal among his fellow countrymen. To non-German readers, though its critical concepts may be somewhat alien and its interpretations not in all cases acceptable, it will be welcome as a fresh and interesting contribution to the criticism of the *Aeneid*.

University College, Bangor

M. L. CLARKE

A NEW TEUBNER TEXT OF HORACE

Q. Horati Flacci *Opera* iterum recognouit FRIDERICUS KLINGNER. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxii + 378. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$3.75.

THE appearance of a new text of Horace in the Teubner series is a notable event and provides at the same time welcome evidence that classical scholarship in Germany retains its customary vigour. The present volume is a second edition but differs only in minor details from the first, which was published in 1939 and for obvious reasons did not reach us. It contains a critical introduction, Suetonius' *Vita*, the text with *testimonia* and apparatus criticus, and, finally, Vollmer's indexes of metres, prosody, grammar, and proper names. The whole work has been carried out with great care and thoroughness, and displays acquaintance not only with the older Horatian scholars but also with those of recent date such as Lejay, Villeneuve, Lenchantin, Housman, and Fraenkel.

The most original and interesting feature of the book is the introduction; for here Klingner makes a fresh attempt to unravel the complicated problems of the interrelation of the manuscripts. He has not made it his business to search for new codices or to re-examine those which are already known but has, in general, been content with the abundant material supplied by Keller and Holder. His purpose is rather to reassess the evidence in the hope that he may provide a more convincing explanation of the descent of the manuscripts and remedy the deficiencies which he finds in both Keller and Vollmer, his predecessors. Put briefly, Keller's weakness was that he did not attempt to account for the erratic conduct of his Class I, which agreed with Class II in the lyrics but with Class III in the hexameters; while Vollmer's fault lay in an oversimplification (*mira simplicitas*) which forced the manuscripts into two classes by Procrustean methods.

Klingner's own theory endeavours to meet and overcome these difficulties. He holds that the text of Horace came down from antiquity in two separate streams, each represented by a single codex now lost. From them are derived two *genera* of manuscripts which he calls respectively \mathcal{E} (= Keller's Class II) and Ψ (= Keller's Class III). Apart from the Old Blandinian, which preserves traces of an independent tradition, \mathcal{E} and Ψ are our ultimate sources for Horace's text, and it should be the aim of criticism to reconstitute their readings. In addition to \mathcal{E} and Ψ there is a third *genus* which he calls Q (= Keller's Class I). Q is a mixed *genus* and is derived from an early-ninth-century recension which drew both on \mathcal{E} and Ψ : accordingly it supports now the one and now the other.

The influence of conflation, however, is not confined to the Q manuscripts. Two of the chief Ψ manuscripts are also mixed—R and π , which Klingner

derives from both Ψ and Q . Even C , one of the chief witnesses of \mathcal{E} , is said to show signs of conflation with Ψ .

All this makes the attempt to draw up a *stemma* exceptionally difficult, for when conflation comes in at the door tidiness flies out at the window. Klingner gives us four separate *stemmata* for the *Odes*, the *Epodes*, the *Satires*, and the *Epistles* respectively, but they are highly complicated, and one cannot help sympathizing with Villeneuve and Lenchantin who—as Klingner tells us—‘ubi viderunt multos codices varie contaminatos esse, quaerere desierunt quibus modis genera et familiae inter se cohaererent: Lenchantin ne referre quidem censuit’!

The value of Klingner’s new approach lies less in his *intricatae rationes* than in his emphasis on the widespread prevalence of conflation in the Horatian tradition. Thanks to conflation, readings are bandied about from one line of descent to another, and it therefore follows that the true reading *may* occur anywhere (as the fifteenth-century Gothanus, alone of surviving manuscripts, has preserved traces of *campum lusumque trigonem* in *Sat.* i. 6. 126). What that true reading is will be determined, not by *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, but by the trained judgement of the critic weighing the probabilities, intrinsic and transcriptional. This is frankly recognized by Klingner himself: ‘quid verum sit, nec numero neque auctoritate testium diiudicari potest: expendendae sunt lectiones singulae’.

Klingner’s actual text is less adventurous than his introduction: indeed, if the editor’s name and apparatus could be suppressed, even an expert might take some time to realize that he was reading Horace in a new edition. This is as it should be: Horace has been edited and re-edited by so many generations of scholars that at this latter day it is difficult to combine both novelty and sanity. Klingner is essentially conservative. He admits only three transpositions: he seldom deletes (exceptions are *Od.* ii. 16. 21–4, iii. 11. 17–20); and his choice of variants is generally one that has found support from many previous editors (though *A.P.* 197 *pacare tumentes* and 423 *artis* are unusual). He does not appear to have made any emendations of his own, and in general he is chary of emendation. He accepts, however, among others, the following: *Od.* i. 2. 39 *Marsi*; 25. 20 *Euro*; ii. 17. 14 and iii. 4. 69 *Gyges*; *Sat.* ii. 6. 29 *quam rem agis?*; *A.P.* 101 *adflent*. His treatment of the more notorious *cruces* may perhaps not always commend itself, e.g. *Od.* iii. 24. 4 *terrenum omne tuis et mare publicum*; iv. 8 delete lines 17 and 33; *Epist.* i. 2. 31 *cessatum ducere somnum* (what is the construction and meaning?); 16. 5 *si* (with *temperiem laudes* as apodosis); 18 delete line 91 (leaving no expressed subject to *oderunt porrecta* etc.: Meineke’s deletion of *bibuli* . . . *oderunt* seems preferable).

The apparatus criticus seeks to steer a middle path between Keller’s enumeration of individual manuscripts and Vollmer’s citation of their supposed classes. The result is rather involved, as will be seen from the entry on *Od.* i. 12. 13 (which is fairly typical): parentis \mathcal{E} (*acc.* [sc. *accidentibus*] λ' Q (a ER')) \mathfrak{M} *Pph.* $\sigma\chi$ *Stat.* parentum Ψ (*acc.* $Q(DM)$). It is, however, in keeping with the conscientious scholarship which makes this a valuable edition, and it would be ungrateful to cavil.

University of St. Andrews

T. E. WRIGHT

PHAEDRUS

LÉON HERRMANN: *Phèdre et ses Fables*. Pp. 371. Leiden: Brill, 1950. Cloth, gld. 32.50.

THIS beautifully produced book is full of surprises. In the first part, a series of chapters on Phaedrus' life and work, fortified with a bibliography of fifteen close-packed pages, we are invited to believe that he wrote not only the *Fables* but also the *Apocolocyntosis*, the *Disticha Catonis*, and a large part of the *Culex*—all of it except the last two lines, which are Virgil's, and three passages (109–20, 216–22, 234–377) which are due to an interpolator later than the appearance of Book V of Statius' *Silvae*. The *Fables* themselves are made to yield new pieces of biographical information in the form of acrostics: few of these leap to the eye in the vulgate text, but transposition of lines, and of words within lines, can do much and interpolation does the rest. We are shown that his *praenomen* was 'Caius' and that he came from Heracleion ('Heraclei' is elicited twice): we are not told why he preferred the French form of his name to the Latin or where he got the peculiar adjective for his home-town. But he seems to have liked odd adjectives: to intimate that he was parodying Seneca he cleverly inserted in the preface to Book II the acrostic *Senecias res dicam*, which it only needs a little manipulation to restore. We even know how he came to grief: reading *Silano* for *Seiano* in iii *praef.* 41 and invoking (1) the epigram A.P. xi. 223, where *Φαῖδρος* the *γραμματικός* (not *πραγματικός*) can have a false receipt drawn before the artist 'Ρούφος gets down to work, (2) C.I.L. xiv. 3471, which concerns a Silanus and an A. Furius Rufus, we see that Phaedrus was the victim of a trumped-up charge, that of forging a receipt for a debt to Furius Rufus, engineered by the Silani who were offended by an insult to their family in the *Apocolocyntosis*. We know also that he was exiled to Cumae: the acrostic 'Cumaei' tells us that. Nor are the novelties confined to Phaedrus. In believing that Silius wrote the *Ilias Latina* (p. 35, n. 2) M. Herrmann has had predecessors; but he must be the first to think of ascribing the *Ad Herennium* (p. 51, n. 2) to Cornutus and the reign of Nero.

But it is in the second part, a text not only of the *Fables* (in a new order) but of the whole corpus now claimed for P., that we find the greatest surprise—an editor of Phaedrus, and a professor of Latin, to whom quantity appears to mean nothing at all and who by his own conjectures turns metrical lines into unmetrical on every other page. In the *Culex* we are given as the beginnings of hexameters (in each the offending word is due to the editor; the manuscript reading follows in brackets) 95 *frondes Hamadryadum* (fontis), 99 *pastor agit horas* (curas), 121 *ipsa loci natura somnum* (domum), 168 *calebant hydrae* (tollebant), 380 *et carmen ut* (tamen); as hexameter endings 57 *imagines undam* (-inis), 174 *loca cum videt lugens* (ingens), 233 *densantur in somnia Parcae* (omnia). In the *Disticha Catonis* we have *tempore adparent* (parent), *rebus et in usu* (censu), *cum te deterreat* (detineat), *sed vita pensanda* (petenda), *patienter amissa* (amice). The iambs of the *Fables* fare no better: *sed fero viso rettulit retro pedem*, *consilium tacito corde damnari stultum*, *cenavit glande humili receptus casa*. The blameless iii *praef.* 13 *animum relaxes otium des corpori* is transformed by M. Herrmann into *corpori otium des animum relaxes*. Why? To provide another acrostic *Cai*. He had six without it.

University of Glasgow

C. J. FORDYCE

THE BUDÉ CAESAR

César: *Guerre d'Afrique*. Texte établi et traduit par A. BOUVET. (Collection Budé.) Pp. li + 129; 2 maps. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper.

PROFESSOR BOUVET has been given an ample allowance of space, and he has used it wisely. He provides the reader with numerous explanatory notes, an introduction to the problems of Caesar's African campaign and the *Bellum Africum*, some maps, a list of dates according to the traditional calendar, Le Verrier, and Groebe, and a very useful and detailed historical Index. He steers a dexterous course between the conflicting theories presented in Stoffel's *Guerre Civile*, Gsell's *Afrique du Nord*, and Veith's contribution to Kromayer's *Antike Schlachtfelder*. The merits of this course will have to be debated by those more conversant than the present reviewer with the problems of geography and military history. But, whatever their decision, the editor has presented the historical evidence fairly, and, indeed, more fully than one would expect in an edition of this kind.

The French version helps to straighten out some of the obscurities of the text, though, in a difficult passage like 49. 2, the translator and the editor seem to be at loggerheads. Occasionally the stylistic quirks of the original are neatly rendered—*oppido perquam pauci*, for instance, by *extrêmement peu nombreux*.

Competent proof-reading would have saved misunderstandings. Bouvet points out that his predecessor's text (A. Klotz's Teubner of 1927) is disfigured by misprints which he has sought to correct—so especially the puzzling *parta* (for *parte*) die 5. 1, *itemque* (for *iamque*) 61. 2, and, perhaps, the confusion of *cum* and *dum* at 88. 3-4. But, alas, his own text offers many new blots, as at 23. 1 *armatum* for *-am*, 2 n. *contulerant* for *-unt*, 26. 5 *interfeci* for *-fici*, 54. 4 *ob reas* (for *eas*) *res*, ib. n. 85 *virtretem* for *virtutem*, 59. 5 *ab* omitted before *adversariorum*, and 63. 3 *quiqueremi* for *quingeremi*. Sometimes identification of passages is made difficult because the sections, in the text or the notes, are not fully numbered. The critical notes are not arranged so as to coincide with the spacing of the text. The punctuation is not wholly reliable, and here, too, misprints occur, such as the full stop in the middle of the sentence at 97. 1. Emendations are occasionally attributed, or reported, wrongly, as at 29. 3 where Woelfflin merely corrected the spelling, 66. 1 *adortus*, 89. 5 *Ocellae*, and 93. 3 *Caninio*.

Bouvet has himself collated the photographs of the manuscripts while Klotz had to be content to gather the readings from earlier editions. Thus his critical notes are more precise than those of his predecessor. On occasion this is of importance for the text, and in two places modern conjectures are now found to be in some manuscripts, namely the archaic form *pote* 54. 4 and *atque ibi C.*, for the redundant *atque ibique*, at 97. 1. Like Fabre in his text of the *Civil War*, Bouvet has made use of a Naples codex s. XII-XIII, which he holds, perhaps correctly, to be an independent member of the class *SL* (σ Klotz).

In his appraisal of the codices, and his use of conjecture, he much resembles Klotz, whom he commends for his 'respect scrupuleux de la tradition manuscrite, qui dissuade avec autorité de mainte tentative de correction'. Not that the editor always approves his predecessor's choice of readings. There are some fifty disagreements, though many of them concern either the vagaries of Latin spelling or else difficulties which are not easily solved on the evidence so far

known. In some cases Klotz's choice has at least convinced the present reviewer; so especially at 43. 1 where the insertion of *cum* is hardly necessary; 49. 1 where Klotz rightly rejected *sibi*, but also, unhappily, Nipperdey's emendation: reference to Rice Holmes's *Roman Republic*, iii. 521, n. 6, would have been to the point; 62. 5 *cum* transposed as in *M*; 74. 2 *deorum* rightly suspected; 80. 3 *incepto itinere* and *confecta*; 90. 1 *accusat*; and 97. 1 *irrogatis*. In other cases the reviewer would side with the Budé editor: so at 8. 5 *miserari*; 19. 1 *perfugere*; 21. 1 *et eo*; 26. 5 *diripi trucidari*; 43. 1 lines 1 and 2; 50. 2 *neesse esse*; 57. 2 *sed restare*; 88. 3 *cum*; 89. 4 *et subito*; 90. 1 *introiit*; 91. 4 *nihil . . . responsi*; and 95. 1 *quae . . . diripuerat*.

I have noted three emendations by the editor. At 18. 5 [*iam*] *hoste iam . . . mittente* certainly is an improvement on Klotz's text, and, unlike it, can be construed. It is, however, only a variation of the older conjecture *iam hoste . . . mittente*, which is slightly more satisfactory on stylistic and palaeographical grounds, but the ablative absolute is not itself certain. The editor's ejection of *secundam autem aciem* at 60. 2, and his long note at pp. 101 f. deserve consideration. So does his emendation *per maritima*, for *per Mauretaniam*, at 95. 1. This is based on *M*'s *per maritimam*, itself probably a conjecture. Or is *per oram maritimam* a more likely correction?

Bouvet's apparatus criticus, unlike Klotz's, is somewhat rigid. Too few alternatives are considered. The text is not as certain as it may appear in this edition. Where so much room was available for notes, the following proposals might have deserved mention: 7. 3 add *cursum*; 9. 1 add *C.* between *cum* and *Saserna*, cf. 10. 1; at 33. 1, considering how cavalierly the scribes of the *Bellum* treat *et* and *que*, the older suggestion *et immuni* was worth recording in spite of Löfstedt's palaeographically more attractive *et immunique*; 35. 4 *ad . . . venimus* transposed; 69. 2 Klotz's speculations were worth reporting in view of the rarity of *vi*, dative singular, and of occasional confusion, in manuscripts, of numerals and nouns; 80. 4 *post tergum cogerentur*; 85. 4 *quem respicerent* ejected; 86. 1 *cum . . . capit* ejected. It is also to be noted that the editor's excursions into palaeography are not above criticism. The relevant portion of the introduction is a little thin. Minuscule is surely not the only kind of script in which *i* and *e* or *o* and *u* were confused—a fact that weakens the force of the argument at pp. xlv f. The editor's practice of indiscriminately using, in his critical notes, small or capital initial letters in proper names is likely to mislead the unwary. It certainly obscures the reason for the frequent confusion, in the codices, of common and proper nouns. Even now no certainty has been attained as regards the proper names at chapter 19.

In textual matters much remains to be done. The *Bellum Africum*, like the *Hispaniense*, has recently become a favourite field for stylistic research, especially by the Swedish school. While Bouvet makes some reference to Löfstedt's early work, and maintains a sensible middle course in the treatment of colloquialisms, the dearth of references to work later than 1927 (the date of Klotz's edition) makes it hard to understand the stylistic implications of many a variant reading. Two instances must suffice. In his *Syntactica* (ii. 223, n. 2) Löfstedt showed admirable restraint in refusing to claim as legitimate pleonasm *atque ibique Sallustio . . . relicto* 97. 1; in its place he was inclined to accept *atque ibi C. Sallustio . . . relicto*. This was then (in 1933) known only as an emendation. Now Bouvet records *ibi C.* as a reading of the *Mediceus* (s. XI–XII) which occasionally diverges from the other two codices of its group. This may be no

more than an emendation due to the scribe, who is known to make use of conjecture. However this may be, here surely a reference to Löfstedt was called for, but is not found in this edition. Again, in a similar case, no reference is provided at 97. 3. There, all codices (apart from *N*, which repeats the ending of the preceding word) offer the genitive *ponderis* instead of the usual adverb *pondo* 'by weight'. J. Svennung has defended the manuscript reading as a colloquialism (*Orosiana*, Uppsala, 1922, p. 11). J. B. Hofmann has accepted his suggestion (*Lat. Gram.*, p. 400) and mentions the similar genitive *altitudinis* which also occurs in the *Bellum*. The defence of the manuscript reading may well be wrong, but as it is, the information provided by the editor is insufficient for the reader to make his choice.

Despite these shortcomings, the student of the text will find it advisable to use the new Budé along with the older texts for the evidence of the manuscripts, the translation, and the historical notes.

University of Liverpool

C. O. BRINK

APPENDIX SALLUSTIANA

Appendix Sallustiana. Ed. A. KURFESS. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Fasc. prior: C. Sallusti Crispi *Epistulae ad Caesarem senem de re publica*. Editio tertia. Pp. viii + 28. Fasc. posterior: [Sallusti] *in Ciceronem et invicem Inactivae*. Editio altera emendata. Pp. vi + 25. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Paper, \$0.60, 0.57.

IN this long-needed addition to post-war Teubner issues Dr. Kurfess has re-edited as two fascicules, under the new title of *Appendix Sallustiana*, the *Epistulae ad Caesarem*, which he published first in 1920 and again in 1930, and the *Inactivae*, first published by him in 1914. Unfortunately the value of the *Appendix* is reduced by disparity of treatment. Fasc. i contains the normal additional preface, which records the view that *Epist.* ii dates to approximately September, 50 B.C., *Epist.* i to May, 46 B.C. Textual changes are listed, with twenty-two titles of recent work on the *Epist.* Fasc. ii, however, is not thus self-complete. It lacks among other things all discussion of manuscripts, since it omits (presumably for economy) the 1914 preface. Mere reference thereto, and to the editor's own *Dissertatio* (Berlin, 1913), is not satisfactory. The new preface refers also to Sallustian material listed in Bursian, and in particular to W. Farber and O. Seel. The latter's views on the spurious character of the *in Ciceronem* are approved—with the suggestion that it may be an excerpt from some historical work (C. Asinius Pollio?) of the Augustan age—and from him is printed (as Index III) a list of its non-Sallustian verbal usages.

The text of the *Epist.* reverts to the 1920 edition in ii. 4. 2 (*M. Catoni Orelli*) and 5. 5 (<*ac*> Kroll rejected). ii. 5. 3 (a passage which the Praef., p. vii, confuses with that in 5. 4, two lines later) reads in *arvis* Douza, and no longer mentions *in agris* Poehlmann (ed. 2: *in armis* V ed. 1); in 7. 6 *honorem* V (edd. 1 and 2) is rightly replaced by *honore* Edmar. i. 5. 6 now prints *†aec conquiri†*; the apparatus (cf. Praef., p. vii) suggests doubtfully that it may be an error for *nec<lectis> concupiscit*. Two misprints have crept into the text: i. 7. 4 *populus* and ii. 13. 8 *paucissimus*. The *conspectus siglorum* omits the symbol *l* (= editio Romana iterata). It is a relief to find that testimonia and indexes are now more reliable. More than eighty corrections have been made; but at

least twenty errors remain, mostly in Index IV. In the apparatus *nequevit* Jord. should be included at i. 7. 1 (cf. Index II, s.v. 'ei'); at 8. 4 and 6 '*absurdum* Jord.' and '*faciunt susp.* Jord.' suggest a difference unwarranted by Jordan's apparatus (contrast ii. 9. 3 and 4).

The most important of the dozen textual changes in the *Invectivae* are in C. 1. 1 *iudicia rei publicae*, 2. 3 *tamen se C. dicit* (both differing from *Diss.*), in S. 6. 18 *deditorum* (replacing the usual *debitorum*), and 8. 21 *totidem putas . . . quot*; smaller changes include in C. 4. 7 *insequeris* H^b (contrast *Diss.*, pp. 35-6), removal of brackets from *de eo . . . obiectat* in in S. 1. 3, where also *id* (not in as given in apparatus) is omitted before *faciam*, and acceptance of the form *comesto* in 7. 20. In the text, in C. 1. 1 *corruptus ist* and in S. 3. 7 *scribentum* need correction. Before *res gestae* in in S. 2. 4 insert *et*. As in Fasc. i, testimonia and indexes have received much-needed attention, but not a complete purge. In the former, for example, *ἐμν* reappears on p. 4. 14, though *οὔτε* (*sic*, ed. 1) is corrected, and on p. 5. 7 for *quae* read *qua*; in the latter several entries (*adsecula*, *despectu* <*i habuit*>, e.g.) do not correspond with the printed text.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK

CICERO'S LETTERS

Marci Tulli Ciceronis *Epistularum ad Familiares libri sedecim*. Edidit HUBERTUS MORICCA. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pars prior (libri i-viii): pp. lxxii+314. Pars altera (libri ix-xvi): pp. 315-717. Turin: Paravia, 1950. Paper, L. 1,200, 1,300.

A NEW edition of these letters, with a fairly full apparatus, is welcome: both Mendelssohn and Sjögren are now unobtainable, and the Budé edition (of Cicero's whole correspondence) is still far from completion. The text is preceded by a *Praefatio* on the manuscripts, by lists of *Testimonia*, of the principal editions (Mr. A. L. Irvine is credited with an edition of Cicero's whole correspondence!), and of other relevant literature, and by a chronological table of the letters; it is followed by an *Index Nominum*, reprinted (with the minimum of change) from the Oxford text.

The text itself has been set up from Sjögren's (it reproduces a misprint at p. 332, l. 17) with little change in punctuation but with numerous alterations of reading and of spelling; I shall confine my remarks on the text to these alterations, since the name of Sjögren amply guarantees the essential soundness of the rest. The alterations of reading total about 170, of which over 70 are in passages obelized or asterisked by Sjögren; Moricca himself has fewer than 20 obeli or asterisks. Throughout he sticks to M (Mediceus 49. 9) as closely as possible; far too often he accepts its reading either as it stands or with an impossible minimum of emendation. Of all his alterations of Sjögren very few are convincing, only about a half even possible, and most of the rest unmentionable. The most convincing are the few cases in which he accepts an emendation where Sjögren keeps to the manuscripts; e.g. i. 9. 21 <*in*> *prae-stantibus*; viii. 11. 3 *non audent*; xi. 13. 3 *suclamatum est ei frequenter*; xiii. 23. 2 *quo [et] est*; xvi. 27. 2 *fero <in> oculis*. Among the possible readings are such restorations (of passages obelized by Sjögren) as iii. 8. 2 *sollicitudine et significatione*; vi. 17. 2 *valuerunt ut valent*; vii. 7. 2 <*habes*> *imperatorem*; viii. 10. 3 *sin a<utem>*, ut

fit, aut non erit; ix. 6. 6 *quae tua <interesse> audiero*. Among the bad readings are most of the thirty or so which he takes over from Festa (*Riv. di Fil.* xxiii. 133 ff., 199 ff.), and all of the fifteen which he takes over (in Book VIII) from Gaffiot (*Rev. de Phil.* 1927, 133 ff.). Here are some specimens of Festa: ii. 7. 4 *a senati auctore*; v. 7. 3 *tibi, multo maiore quam Africanus fuit a(nimo), me, non multo minore quam Laelium*; vi. 4. 4 *vidisse me prius quam ceteros*; vi. 13. 2 *ad fin.*, retention of manuscript reading, the antecedent of *quorum* being *familiarissimis*, and *meus* being supplied with *amor*; viii. 5. 3 *quam hoc Caesari, qui sua causa rem p. non curent, superet, non te fallit*; explained by Moricca 'non te fallit quam hoc genus hominum [!], scilicet eorum qui sua causa rem p. non curent, superet, scil. supersit, abundet, superfluat, Caesari'; xi. 27. 5 *in reliquis officiis* (Madvig's *officio* is more certain than any MS. reading). The suggestions of Gaffiot adopted by Moricca are really, despite his laudatory superlatives, arrant nonsense, culminating perhaps in viii. 8. 2 *incipiet* (*incipiare* = 'pice illinere, quae ultima est rerum ad vinaria opera spectantium; hic translate usurpatum idem valet ac *finem facere, ictum letalem inferre*'); Caelius wrote a Latin of his own, but he did not write gibberish. (Moreover, some of the ideas—about eighteen—adopted from Constans are more ingenious than convincing.) The quality of Moricca's scholarship is revealed not only by his adoption of such readings but also (e.g.) by his treatment of a wrong *at tamen* offered by the manuscripts: twice, where Tyrrell and Purser refer him to Madvig's note (on *Fin.* ii. 85), he duly adopts *ac tamen*; once (xii. 14. 7), through following the out-of-date edition of T.-P. vol. vi, he retains *at tamen*.

Moricca's original ideas are few. Three times he defends the manuscript reading where it has never been, and cannot be, defended: vi. 5. 3 *ad init.* ('perspicuus sensus', he says, but he does not impart it to the reader); viii. 7. 2 '*nondum rettuleras*' (as a question which Caelius imagines Cicero asking: 'why have you waited so long to tell me?'—a novel use of *nondum*); viii. 12. 2 '*quid ergo?*' *st!* *tamen quasi aliquod amicis . . . locutus sum* (*st!* will not do; still less will *aliquod* (= *aliquot*) *amicis* as abl. instr.). Twice he adopts a slight correction which no previous scholar has considered sufficient by itself: viii. 15. 2 *eo nunc cum cohortibus* (with *nunc cum* there must be a lacuna after *cum*); xii. 15. 4 he merely brackets *neque* before *nostra*. His text contains only one original emendation (ix. 10. 2 *ingentium epularum*: unsatisfactory); his apparatus mentions three more, of which one (i. 9. 26 *felicitate aliquid vellem*) is bad and two (vi. 4. 1; ix. 10. 2 *ingentium herbarum*) are indifferent.

His differences from Sjögren in spelling are all due to his simple-minded trust in M; hence *eidem* (nom. sing.), *iei* (nom. plur.), *mieis* (which even Mendelssohn considered 'nimis archaismus'), many *-is* forms in acc. (and some in nom.) plur., three instances of *sta, stic* (but at vii. 13. 2, on exactly the same evidence, *istic*), and over twenty examples of weird forms of *iuvare* like *ivat, ivit, ivet, iveris* (Mendelssohn, by comparison, is conventional in printing *iuat*, etc.).

His apparatus provides (from his own collations) new evidence on three manuscripts. First, in about sixteen passages he explicitly corrects current beliefs (based on Mendelssohn, as corrected in a few details by Festa and by Sjögren) about the reading of M; about twice as often he tacitly corrects or supplements them. The only effect on his text, as compared with Sjögren's, is (a) three different readings: iii. 5. 1. *scripserim* (for *-eram*), a return to the vulgate; iii. 7. 6 *omnibus meis officiis* (for *omn. off. meis*), the pre-Orelli reading; vi. 13. 3 *tardius sit* (for *tard. fit*), where (despite M and Moricca) *fit* is right and *sit*

a corruption; (b) half-a-dozen different spellings. The value of his tacit corrections (all of minutiae) is impaired both by the impossibility of distinguishing an intentional correction from a careless mistake of Moricca or of his printer (confidence is shattered by a note like xii. 5. 1 *ages M*, *ages M*²) and by the fact that occasionally there are similar discrepancies from his predecessors in his reports of G and H, two manuscripts which he has *not* examined. Secondly, for Books ix–xvi he has made a new collation of D (that used by Mendelssohn was, as Constans pointed out, inaccurate); this has not affected his text, but has enabled him to correct Mendelssohn's reports; it has also, unfortunately, inflated his apparatus with spelling details which Mendelssohn deliberately ignored, and which give quite a false impression of completeness to his apparatus as a whole. Thirdly, again for Books ix–xvi, he provides the first extensive collation of V (Parisinus 14761), to which attention was drawn by Constans (*Rev. des Ét. lat.* viii. 345 ff.). The result of this is negligible: nowhere has V influenced Moricca's text. (Constans did adopt its reading once, at xvi. 16. 2 *et sermonibus et humanitate*.) It is true that in about thirty passages V alone preserves the true reading, but they are all passages where the true reading is obvious and the necessary emendation was made long ago. Moreover, Moricca's collation of V is both haphazard (being at once too full of unimportant details of spelling and not full enough on more important points) and untrustworthy (as becomes evident when it is checked against the manuscript itself; e.g. ix. 1. 2 *videbar*, not *videbam*; ix. 2. 1 *amantissimo tui tum*, not *amantissimo tum*).

Apart from this new manuscript evidence, Moricca's apparatus is essentially a careless, uncritical, unmethodical compilation from Mendelssohn, Mueller, T.-P., the Oxford text, Sjögren, and Constans. From these are lifted (a) lists of nineteenth-century scholars who adopted one reading or another; Mueller set out in 1896 'ut recentiorum editorum differentias notaret omnes, selectas aliorum', but why should his lists be incorporated in an apparatus of 1950? (b) many conjectures which should have been ignored; on the other hand, Moricca mentions practically no conjectures which are not reported by one or other of the editions (the *Additamentum* which precedes the *American Index Verborum* contains a ready-made collection of modern suggestions, and should have been used, though with discretion); (c) lists of references for grammatical, syntactical, or textual points, taken over without adequate systematization or verification. False, inadequate, irrelevant, and antiquated references abound, as do typographical errors (some very misleading) and misrepresentations (or inadequate representations) of the views of other scholars (through misreading of Sjögren's symbols Lehmann is confused once with Lebreton and three times with Wesenberg). Gross instances of carelessness are the retention of Sjögren's lineation (at least 12 times), the attribution of readings to manuscripts in passages which they omit (about 20 times) or of two different readings to the same manuscript, the attribution of critical notes to the wrong word (through such a confusion a nonsensical reading, *debeam* for *debebam*, has crept into the text at vi. 1. 7), and the misdating (due to unsuccessful conflation of T.-P. and Sjögren), both in text and in chronological table, of three letters (1, 5, 7) in Book vi, with the result that one (7) turns out to have been written about a year before that (vi. 8) to which it is a reply.

This edition is on a pretentious scale; it is therefore important that its pretensions be exposed. It does no credit to the 'Corpus Paravianum'.

THE TEUBNER CICERO

M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta, Fasc. 48: *De Officiis* tertium rec. C. ATZERT; *De Virtutibus* post O. Plasberg iterum rec. W. Ax. (Bibliotheca Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xlii + 189. Leipzig: Teubner, 1949. Cloth and boards, \$3.07.

ATZERT published his first edition of the *De Officiis* in 1923, confessing in the preface that circumstances had prevented him from fulfilling the task to his entire satisfaction. The second edition appeared in 1932, but the changes in Cicero's text were few. Since these earlier editions are already known to the scholarly world, only what is new in the third edition will be noticed here.

The preface is in substance the same. But on pp. xxiii ff. the crux in ii. 23 is discussed afresh. Atzert regards *apparet cuius* as a marginal gloss on *huius tyranni*, and emends the meaningless *portui* to *posteris*. This gives excellent sense and is a brilliant conjecture. On pp. xxviii ff. there is a new discussion of i. 51 in *qua . . . communia omnia*. Atzert now rightly admits Madvig's *legibus* for *e quibus*, but his attempt to show that the passage is a conflation of an original sentence with a marginal note added later by Cicero himself is open to grave objection. On pp. xxx ff. Atzert records the support that has been given, since the second edition, to his views about the manner in which the *De Officiis* was originally published.

The *Conspectus Subsidiarum* has been enlarged by some dozen entries; about half of these refer to publications since 1932, the most important being two by Pohlenz.

As regards the text itself: in i. 8 Atzert now prints Pearce's *καθῆκον*, but implies that the credit for this necessary addition belongs to Pohlenz. In i. 106 he accepts Pohlenz's insertion of *nostra* between *natura* and *excellencia*, an emendation much to be preferred to the insertion of *hominis* printed by some previous editors. In i. 122 Stürenburg's insertion of *ne* in the phrase *si <ne> in eiusmodi quidem* is now accepted—rightly. In ii. 1 Atzert inserts *comunoditates* ad between *homines* and *facultatem*. This is gratuitous. The meaning he desires is contained in the phrase *ad uitae cultum* just before. In ii. 33 he now regards *et fidis* as an interpolation. In ii. 37 *quae qui . . . rapit* he prints a superfluous addition proposed by Goldbacher; space does not permit discussion here. In ii. 56 between *breue* and *exiguum* he gives Pohlenz's *excitetur*, a more likely emendation than his own *exigatur* printed in the second edition. In iii. 39 *quamquam potest id quidem* he marks *potest* as spurious; but his arguments here are wrong-headed, and he would have been wiser to print *nequaquam potest id quidem* (Manutius) or *quamquam non potest id quidem* (Goldbacher). In iii. 74 where the best manuscripts have *o turpe notam temporum nomen illorum*, the dett. *o turpe notam nomen illorum temporum*, and c p *o turpe nomen illorum temporum*, he now prints *o turpe illorum temporum*, quoting iii. 87 *turpe imperio* in support. This does not seem a good solution. In iii. 110 he gives: 'nam quod aiunt, quod ualde utile sit, id fieri honestum, <rectius dicendum est ualde utile fieri, quod sit honestum>, immo uero esse, non fieri'. Though this insertion, which Pohlenz proposed, is ingenious and attractive, it is not necessary. In this sort of vigorous argument the verb of saying can readily be understood to govern *immo uero 'esse', non 'fieri'*.

I have noticed one or two misprints in the text: *anima* for *animi* (i. 64); *acommodamus* (i. 115); full-stop for comma between *dixi* and *Alexander* in ii. 26; *cupiditates* (iii. 36); *repugnetque* for *repugnetne* (iii. 50). The two last have survived from the second edition. A garbled quotation from Havet on p. xxvii has persisted through three editions: 'tout ce paragraphe (114) iure avec ce qui l'entoure que Cicéron étendait évidemment la placer ailleurs'. Finally, in the note on line 19, p. 73 *comitate* should surely read *commoditate*.

Writing in 1882, C. F. W. Müller conceived it possible that there existed better manuscripts of the *De Officiis* than any that had so far been collated. It is therefore of interest to observe that despite the patient and devoted labours of Atzert and of Popp—labours which have earned the gratitude of all lovers of Cicero—the text of the *De Officiis* has not been very much improved since Müller's time.

As regards the *De virtutibus*, Ax has reprinted the two relevant *testimonia*, the fragment of three words quoted by Charisius, and the Latin translation by Knöllinger of those passages from *La Salade*, a work by the fifteenth-century author Antonius de la Sale, which are presumed to be based on Cicero's lost treatise.

St. John's College, Cambridge

A. G. LEE

CICERO'S *DE RE PUBLICA*

LEONARDO FERRERO: M. Tullio Cicerone, *de Re publica*. Introduzione, testo e commento. Pp. xxii + 236. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1950. Paper, L. 450.

THIS book is primarily for schools, and any such edition of the *de Re publica* is faced with a dilemma. Too sketchy a treatment would ignore fundamental points and so rob the book of its significance; yet an edition dealing thoroughly with everything would be too costly. Ferrero has, on the whole, steered a wise course.

In a clear introduction he emphasizes that the work was written with a passionate earnestness in the urgency of the years 54–51 B.C. He describes with sympathetic understanding Cicero's artistry and politico-historical philosophy. He does not discuss the thorny problem of the 'rector', but as a short summary of Cicero's ideal government for Rome one might well adopt his phrase, 'il principato illuminato, paternalisticamente democratico', suggesting as it does that humanity, moderation, realism and a certain bewilderment so typical of Cicero as a political thinker. While, however, he rightly does not bury Cicero under a welter of *Quellenforschung*, he might profitably have underlined more clearly Cicero's debt to the Greeks, particularly the Stoics, instead of leaving this to be inferred from the admittedly copious references in the commentary.

He prints the whole of the extant text—a heavy load for schoolboys, but the advanced student gains. There is also a valuable appendix of *testimonia*, which, however, includes certain passages which most editors have inserted in the body of the text. He summarizes these latter in those parts of the text where they are usually found, but he considers that a sharper distinction should be made between fragments and references, and the young thus enabled to read the book more quickly. But the omission of what are surely Cicero's own words

in iii. 33, *vera lex est recta ratio* . . ., would be a serious loss. It is unfortunate that considerations of economy prevented Ferrero from printing this passage and some of the references twice over.

The text itself, being mainly based on the editions of Ziegler and Castiglioni, requires little comment. Ferrero rightly gives liberal reconstructions of such fragmentary passages as i. 54 and ii. 19, even if the conjectures are far from certain. In i. 69 *primis* (Zachariae, adopted by Ziegler) seems better than *optime primis* (suggested by Castiglioni in his apparatus, adopted by Ferrero), which, though palaeographically plausible, is unconvincing in the context. In ii. 10 he rightly deletes *absorberet*, but simply to remove it leaves the sentence unbalanced. If, however, *ex terra* was put before *inventas* by Cicero and then transposed by a scribe, it is easy to see why some such word as *absorberet* might be inserted by a later scribe. In ii. 51 he unwisely deserts both Ziegler and Castiglioni and adopts *peripatetico*, the attribution of which to Plato's *Republic* can hardly be justified by statements in Cicero that the Old Academy and the Peripatetics held essentially the same views. Finally, consistency in spelling is surely preferable to absolute fidelity to the manuscript. To take but one instance, why in ii. 34 *collocavit* but in ii. 17 *conlocatus* and in iii. 12 *conlocare* (though this appears as *collocare* in the note)?

Syntactical explanations, particularly of subjunctives, are deficient: adverbial *qui* receives a note in i. 47, but not in i. 10 or ii. 10. Also, more phrases might have been translated. Explanations of allusions, however, are seldom missing and are usually full, and there are plenty of apt quotations. In particular, Ferrero elucidates historical difficulties simply but adequately while avoiding discussion of controversial questions, notably in the involved passage about the *comitia centuriata* (ii. 39-40). But, although his comment on *late influentis* (ii. 10), 'la larghezza della foce assicura la regolarità dei traffici marittimi', may have been true for the ships of the time of Romulus, he might have mentioned the tendency of the Tiber mouth to silt up, which eventually made necessary the artificial harbour of Claudius. Lastly, in *argumenta plus quam testes valent* (i. 59) it is not the mutual contradictoriness of the *testes* to which Laelius is objecting but the use at all of *testes* (equivalent to the authorities quoted in an English court, not to the eyewitnesses called), to *auctoritas*, in fact, as a substitute for *ratio*; cf. *N. D.* i. 10.

The book will be of value to Italian schoolboys—and to others, the reviewer included.

University College, Cardiff

G. H. POYSER

THE BUDÉ PLINY

A. ERNOUT: Pline l'Ancien, *Histoire Naturelle*, Livre XII. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 14+62 (double)+50. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949. Paper, 250 fr.

SCHOLARS will be grateful for this edition. The text is based on Jan-Mayhoff, but M. Ernout has himself collated D, and is at pains to show the close connexion of D, E, and F. In a lucid introduction Pliny's methods are illustrated and assessed ('sa science, si l'on peut employer ce mot, est surtout livresque'),

and the possible relationship of Pliny to Dioscorides is examined: Ernout concludes that Pliny probably knew the *Materia Medica* and used it.

The editor prints two only of his own conjectures (*durae*, 20, and *nascitur*, 100), and is refreshingly cautious in admitting those of others. He makes suggestions in his apparatus at 12, 17, 33 (where *magnitudine* seems the best of his three proposals for filling the lacuna—cf. 35 below), 105 (*melior qui mollior tactu, minus fragilis*—attractive), 111. In 7 he successfully defends *adolescens* (DEF) against M's *augescere*; in 9 he retains the manuscript reading without adding *unius* (so Mayhoff), but his retention of *optantem* below (which he admits to be forced) seems less happy, though he rightly rejects Pintianus' *captantem* (is *arcentem* possible?). In 22 he argues convincingly for Madvig's *sui semper heres*; in 73 he keeps *intellegant* (DEF), though his note is hardly apposite; in 81 he justifiably reads, with M, *styracem in foliibus petunt hircinis*; in 87 Mayhoff's *remi trahant vel inpellant vela* seems slightly preferable to the vulgate which he accepts; in 103 he rejects Mayhoff's *autumno* (*aut enim*, D¹EF), and reads *enim* (D²d), which is perfectly logical; in 106 he prints *flore praestantiore cui numerosius* (see his note, an admirable example of his clarity). I imagine that *sine parte* (20) is a misprint. This judicious and sane text is most pleasurable to use, and is far more reliable than the Loeb edition.

The translation is careful, elegant, sober, and more precise than many French versions are. In 2, *moribus primordia ingerere nostris*, does 'instruire nos mœurs de leurs origines' quite convey the sense ('to stress the first beginnings of our progress')? In 13 *infelicitas* is more than 'infortune'; 16, *gentes* seems to bear the special sense of 'foreign nations' (so in 1, 'barbarian peoples'), cf. Löfstedt, *Synt.* ii, p. 465; 19, *in tributi auctoritate tertia res fuerit*, 'figure comme troisième matière dans les impositions du tribut' scarcely does justice to *auctoritate* ('took third place in the order of precedence for tribute'); 46, *ne sint fragilia et arida potius quam sicca folia*, is 'les feuilles ne doivent pas être cassantes, et fermes plutôt que desséchées' quite right? In 58, *laxatur hic plaga, non admittitur*, E. has 'c'est là qu'on ouvre une plaie, sans rien enlever', but surely *hic* refers to *cortex*, and *plaga* is ablative. In 102 I doubt the insertion of 'd'après eux' to introduce the oblique construction: a new subject seems necessary, for the champions of Petraean *myrobalanum* can hardly be those who have just been stated to prefer the Aethiopian variety. In 121, is 'forte' the best equivalent for *austerus*?

The commentary (42 pp., to 44 pp. of text) is valuable; apart from textual discussion, it is enriched by authoritative notes from M. le Chanoine P. Fournier, *Directeur* of the *Monde des Plantes*; specialists will find much of importance here concerning the identification of Pliny's trees and plants. Abundant illustrations from Theophrastus and other authors are given.

This book is a distinguished addition to the series, and it is good to know that other Plinian commentaries are planned (see *R.É.L.*, xxvi, 1948, p. 341); the sooner they appear the better.

University College, Cardiff

R. G. AUSTIN

THE *CENA TRIMALCHIONIS*

Petronius: The *Cena Trimalchionis* together with Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and a selection of Pompeian inscriptions. Edited by W. B. SEDGWICK. Second Edition. Pp. 151; 4 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

For a generation Sedgwick's school edition of the *Cena* has been the stand-by not only of the sixth-formers for whom it was intended, but of undergraduates and their seniors as well. Reprinted twice since 1925, it now marks its silver jubilee by appearing in a second edition. To keep the price within the range of readers' pockets, the original plates have been used with a minimum of changes. At first sight all that is new appears to be five pages of additional notes at the end of the book. But in reading the two editions side by side one soon finds that though the pagination remains the same throughout, there is scarcely a page of the commentary in which the author has not added a further reference, corrected a dubious explanation, or turned a more felicitous phrase.

Of the new material, the following seems most worthy of note:

30. 9: He now reads *oecario* (*precario* HLtp, *atrio* Bücheler, *prooecario* Oriolius).

31. 2: He adds the note '*dominicus* = *domini* (vulgar?)'. Would a brief discussion of the changing spheres of application of adjective and possessive genitive in Greek, Latin, and English (cf. in particular Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, i². 107-24 and literature there cited) have been beyond the understanding or interest of sixth-formers?

39. 12: In his original note he states that *prae* is construed with the accusative only by Petronius. He now quotes an example from an inscription of Pope Leo I. But the construction is quite common in later Latin (cf. Leumann-Hofmann, 533).

40. 1: He now thinks that *tolaria*, the reading of H, may be a genuine vulgar form, and cites in support *τολάρια*, *Dura-Europos Fourth Report*, p. 102.

43. 4: He now reads *quantum*, observing that it is a vulgarism for the genitive of price. It would have been useful to quote some other examples, or to refer to the literature in which they may be found (Löfstedt, *Vermischte Studien*, 173; *Syntactica*, i². 270 ff.; Norberg, *Syntaktische Forschungen*, 103 ff.).

45. 4: He now supports *alicubi* = *aliubi* by two passages from Pomponius Mela and one from Tertullian. He might have linked this with the corresponding use of *aliquis* = *alius* (cf. Löfstedt, *Beiträge*, 113 ff.; *Philologischer Kommentar*, 174).

58. 13: In his new note he says '*mufrius* may be connected with *mu* (57. 8)'. Is it not more likely to be connected with *mufro* in a list of animals in Polemios Silvius, *Chron. Minor*. i. 543. 10 and with the 'moufflon' group of words in Meyer-Lübke 5715?¹

¹ Cf. D. M. Paschall, *The Vocabulary of Petronius* (Baltimore, 1939), p. 26. *Mental Aberration in Roman Comedy and*

The Introduction is reproduced unchanged from the first edition. Sedgwick was no doubt wise not to modify his opening sentence, 'The author of the *Satyricon* . . . is now universally identified with the Petronius who is well known as the minister of Nero', in the light of recent attempts to find a later date for Petronius.¹ But does he still think that the *Satyricon* 'is probably a parody of the Aeneid, with Priapus in the role of Juno' (p. 11)? And is it not somewhat misleading to state that 'even the enemies of the Christians admitted the purity of their lives' (p. 12)? Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean orgies are the charges which the early Roman apologists have to rebut. And can he support his claim that in the language of Trimalchio and his circle 'there are Campanian peculiarities' (p. 18)? Finally, the bibliography on pp. 22 ff. is not adequately supplemented in the addenda. Besides Friedländer and Becker's Gallus, mention should be made of Carcopino and Paoli; and in the section on the ancient novel the names of Todd and Haight should be added to that of Dunlop.

It is perhaps unfair to suggest changes which would have involved resetting several pages. But sixth-formers and undergraduates would have found a more historical treatment of the latinity of the *Cena* helpful. They will all have some acquaintance with at least one Romance language, and they will have read a fair amount of Latin from Plautus to Suetonius or even Apuleius. It would interest them to be told something of the undercurrent of popular speech running beneath the surface of the Republican and Augustan literary tongue, breaking out here and there, and finally surging up in a mighty flood. A few striking extracts could have illustrated this vividly. It would also have been useful to have the observations on the *mise en scène* and sequence of events of an ancient banquet collected in an introductory note. The young reader is apt to find Trimalchio's feast even more of a *furchtbares Durcheinander* than it actually was.

However, these are vain wishes in an age of economy. In the meantime, it is good to see this excellent book once again available. We hope we shall not have to wait another five lustra for the thorough revision which its author is so well qualified to give to it. 'Litterae thesaurum est, et artificium numquam moritur.'

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

ROMAN HISTORIANS

M. L. W. LAISTNER: *The Greater Roman Historians*. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. XXI.) Pp. viii+196. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1947. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.

HARD labour on Roman history, but nothing much on the Roman historians: that is one of the sadder deficiencies of modern scholarship. The latest addition to the series of Sather Lectures will go a long way towards making up for it.

¹ Cf. U. E. Paoli, *Stud. et doc. historiae et iuris*, ii (1936), 368 ff., *Stud. ital. di fil. class.* xiv (1937), 1-46; *Riv. Fil.* lxxvi (1938), 13-39; A. Biscardi, *Stud. ital. di fil. class.* xv

(1938), 71 ff.; *Riv. Fil.* lxxvii (1939), 342 ff.; and more recently E. V. Marmorale, *La Questione Petroniana* (Bari, 1948).

The title recalls Nisard's book, *Les Quatre Grands Historiens Latins*, those inaugural discourses of a Professor of Latin Eloquence a century ago. There the resemblance ends—on the whole fortunately. Nisard, by including Caesar among the historians and allocating him as much space as Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus together, facilitated his task without great benefit to the subject. Professor Laistner's attractive and well-proportioned volume exhibits eight lectures in 161 pages, supported by 19 pages of annotation (pp. 165–83) and two indexes. He has managed to secure balance, range, and depth. First of all comes the origin and development of historiography at Rome, with some account of authors that have not survived. This is achieved in the two introductory chapters, 'The Hellenistic Background' and 'Historical Writing in Rome to the Death of Caesar' (pp. 1–44). Then follow the dominant figures, one chapter for Sallust, two each for Livy and Tacitus, and one for Ammianus Marcellinus. To have Ammianus there is right for every reason—style, integrity, experience of affairs, political and psychological insight. The historian who continued Tacitus and earned the admiration of Gibbon is not likely to be underestimated nowadays. Laistner's own studies of the later Empire lend both enthusiasm and authority to his appreciation. The reader will be in a position to compare, for his pleasure and also for his instruction, the full-length portrait by E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge, 1947). Thompson is especially illuminating when he discusses Ammianus' originality as an historian, the obstacles that prevented him from telling the whole truth about certain transactions—and his bold insistence on the selfish ambitions of the rich and powerful. For the last of these three themes Ammianus on Petronius Probus (xxvii. 11. 1–6) provides a classic diagnosis—and not irrelevant to what happens in other ages.

To approach the core of the volume, the five chapters concerning Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Here is much of note and value, independent judgement backed by broad scholarship. Sallust, the author claims, has been rated above his merits. He stigmatizes bias and inaccuracy, lack of subtlety, and lack of originality.

Not all his instances are of equal force. While blaming Sallust for an unfriendly portrayal of Pompeius Magnus, Laistner accepts the highly idealized Sertorius whom Berve might seem to have rendered questionable (*Hermes*, lxxiv. 199 ff.). And, adverting upon Sallust's comparison of Cato and Caesar, he writes 'Sallust achieved a brilliant piece of writing, but at the cost of his credit as a historical authority' (p. 57). Is that quite certain?

In the course of the last fifty years many latinists and historians have not only accepted the *Epistulae ad Caesarem senem* as genuine, but have argued in their favour with powerful resources of erudition and of conviction. What if it were all in vain? It is now nearly thirty years since a young Oxford scholar made the notable contribution: he did his best to show up *Ep. ii*, but was at that time disposed to concede the authenticity of *Ep. i* (H. M. Last, *C.Q.* xvii. 87 ff. and 151 ff.; xviii. 83 f.: cf. now *Mélanges Marouzeau*, 1948, p. 357). Laistner in a footnote firmly states his belief that both are rhetorical forgeries (p. 169). One may add in passing the outspoken opinion of H. Fuchs, that a thorough investigation might now bring down the whole edifice (*Mus. Helv.* iv. 189).

If one may not with safety appeal to the *Epistulae* for help in reconstructing the development of Sallust's thought, something might still be done with the

Sabine origin of this adversary of the Roman *nobilitas*—though Marius and Cicero, did *not* come from 'the Sabine hill country', as stated on p. 47. To give roots and substance to his Livy, however, Laistner sets forth the relevant facts about the city of Patavium—prosperous from the wool trade, a seat of sound morality, and Republican in sentiment. 'Patavinitas' he dismisses briefly, 'for the modern student to hunt for this "Patavinity" would be as rewarding as to search for Scotticisms in Macaulay'. But what if that quality is not a mere matter of spelling, vocabulary, or syntax but something in the soul? Again, the origin of Tacitus might be considered, whom the superficial have sometimes taken for a descendant of the patrician Cornelii. The strong case for Transpadana or Narbonensis ought to be noted (cf. M. L. Gordon, *J.R.S.* xxvi. 145 ff.), and the consular historian could have been brought into relation with his coeval, the first emperor from the provinces. The name of Trajan does not occur—there is only the allusion to the period 'when the *ancien régime* of Augustus seemed to have been in great measure restored' (p. 1).

In one way or another, Tacitus comes off rather poorly in this volume. First, three points of detail. Less than justice is done to the *Agricola* by the remark that 'the military campaigns and topographical details are vague or sketchy and compare unfavourably with the information supplied by Pliny' (p. 112). Recourse to the relevant sections of the *Natural History* fails to bear out the contention. Next, and most important, Tacitus' use of documents. Laistner suspends judgement, appealing to the lack of agreement among scholars, and balancing Ciaceri against Marsh. Ciaceri's categorical negative is even cited—'è chiaro che Tacito non aveva direttamente esaminati gli Atti del senato' (p. 178). The basis of this conviction was worth examining. About an obscure person Tacitus adds 'originem non repperi' (*Ann.* vi. 7). Therefore, says Ciaceri, the historian did not look in the *acta senatus*. The passage and its context indicate the contrary. Compare Asconius on the mother-in-law of L. Piso—'invenire non potui' (p. 10, Clark). A friend of Tacitus thought that he possessed *diligentia* (Pliny, *Epp.* vii. 33. 3). Thirdly, Laistner is sceptical about Tacitus' low view of senators in the reign of Tiberius: 'to attribute a similar servility and lack of spirit to men who had grown up during the Augustan age is simply to imagine the unbelievable' (p. 135). Tacitus has the documentation to refute his critic. Observe, already in the third year of Tiberius Caesar, the *sententiae* expressed by seven men of consular rank—'quorum auctoritates adulationesque rettuli ut sciretur vetus id in re publica malum' (*Ann.* ii. 32). Whence do the names and details derive, if not from the *acta*?

At this late date the general shortcomings of Tacitus are familiar enough—exaggeration, preoccupation with the dynasty and with the senatorial order, inadequacy as a military historian; and especially lack of interest in certain aspects of provincial or municipal history that modern scholars are most curious about. The critics do not always stop to consider what Tacitus was trying to do. He takes many things for granted as known, and the character of Roman history as a literary genre precluded him from supplying detailed and methodical information.

Laistner is aware of these necessary limitations. When the reliability of Tacitus is in question, the capital charge is his portrayal of the Caesars of the Julio-Claudian line. Laistner discovers brilliance, distortion, and even caricature. He also points to the general excellence of the imperial administration, for all the detestable private lives of certain princes. That, indeed, was known

and
rest
T
dis
opin
Livy
liter
ever
agre
is ro
and
stud
T
of vi
the
mor
belo
N
mus
liter
Quin
opin
Sallu
Bras

S. F.
Pp.

THIS
In th
at Ro
four
syste
the fi
and a
to Gr
Roma
genui
decla
Quot
medl
with
views
subje
the la
on Ov
tions

and admitted. An autocrat's power to do either evil or good was not unrestricted.

The author is much more happy (in both senses of the term) with Livy. He discusses the philosophical beliefs of the historian (a mild Stoicism), his political opinions, his reasonableness, his honesty. This is admirably done. Further, Livy is skilfully defended against detractors of his historical capacity. Livy's literary talent and his honesty have never been questioned. Doubts must, however, subsist about his erudition and critical powers, and not everybody will agree that Livy may well have spent the period 39-29 B.C. in preparations: 'it is reasonable to assume that he had formulated his great project long before and that the years between twenty and thirty were expended on preliminary studies' (p. 77).

The author's preference goes strongly for Livy against Tacitus: 'for breadth of view, for his general conception of what historical writing should be, and the manner in which he gave practical expression to it, perhaps also for a more deeply rooted *humanitas*, the first place among the Roman historians belongs to Livy' (p. 139).

Nobody will quarrel with a fair and reasoned statement of belief. Dissent must similarly be justified. History as written by the Romans was a peculiar literary genre, like classical tragedy when composed by the French. Would Quintilian have concurred had he survived to compare Livy with Tacitus? His opinions about Livy and Sallust are instructive (x. 1. 101)—and he called Sallust the 'maior auctor' (ii. 5. 19).

Brasenose College, Oxford

RONALD SYME

ROMAN DECLAMATION

S. F. BONNER: *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and the Early Empire*. Pp. viii+183. Liverpool University Press, 1949. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS comprehensive study of an unduly neglected subject is useful and welcome. In the first two chapters Mr. Bonner surveys the earlier history of declamation at Rome and its background in Greek doctrine and practice; in the third and fourth he proceeds to discuss the technique and procedure of the fully developed system as it is exhibited by the elder Seneca and reflected in the literature of the first century. Chapters 5 and 6 are a detailed re-examination of the origin and authenticity of the 'laws' of the Senecan declamations and their relation to Greek sources and to Roman law; his conclusion is that they are closer to Roman law than has generally been allowed and that they may represent genuine enactments even when the phraseology has been altered by the declaimers to suit their own purposes. Chapter 7, on 'Literary Criticism, Quotation and Allusion in the Senecan Declamations', is something of a medley, in which references to Homer in the declamations appear side by side with a passing reference to Plato made by Seneca, their critic; Seneca's own views on Calvus as orator and poet have nothing to do with the professed subject of the chapter. Chapter 8, on the other hand, which deals briefly with the large subject of the influence of the schools on literature, and particularly on Ovid, Livy, Velleius, and the younger Seneca, is full of interesting observations and suggestions and might well have been expanded.

A few points of detail may be queried. What is the authority for saying that Seneca came to Rome in the very year of Cicero's death (p. 31)? Or that replying to the *Pro Milone* was a 'favourite' pastime of Cestius (p. 136)? Or that Horace 'rarely attended the recitations of the poets' (p. 134: it may well be true, but H. does not say so)? Why call Horace's friend Maximus Lollius when one is not writing verse? Sometimes Mr. Bonner does not say what he appears to mean: 'the evidence of general thinking in these exercises seems predominantly Roman' (p. 131) is a curious remark, and so is the statement that Ovid has *sententiae* 'that might equally well be transplanted to the pages' of Seneca (p. 151). (Equally well with what?)

An ample and serviceable bibliography is appended; but it is odd that a list so full as to include a note which its author may be allowed to call trivial does not contain Müller's edition of 1887. Mr. Bonner seems to have used only Kiessling and Bornecque; in consequence he ascribes to Bornecque an emendation which was made by Otto, C. iii *pr.* 2 *ingeniosis*, and another which goes back to Madvig, C. ix. 2. 26 *ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιὸν μάλινον*. His translation of the latter, 'they err on the right side', is surely misleading; the Greek, if it means anything, does not mean what the English phrase always means.

G. J. FORDYCE

University of Glasgow.

MINUCIUS FELIX

M. PELLEGRINO: M. Minucii Felicis *Octavius*. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. xxvi+62. Turin: Paravia, 1950. Paper, L. 400.

G. QUISPÉL: M. Minucii Felicis *Octavius*, uitgegeven en van commentaar voorzien. (Grieksche en latijnsche schrijvers met aantekeningen, LXI.) Pp. xviii+83. Leiden: Brill, 1949. Paper, gld. 2.

THE text of Minucius Felix, preserved as it is in a single rather bad manuscript (Parisinus 1661, saec. ix, = P: Bruxellensis 10847 is an apograph of P), has always provided a fertile field for conjecture. In particular, earlier editors were inclined to emend wherever the reading of P diverged from the canons of Ciceronian latinity. A cautionary example of what this line of approach could lead to was furnished by the edition of E. Baehrens (Teubner, 1886).

Since Baehrens's time editors have seen that much of what shocked earlier scholars in P could be paralleled in other Latin texts of the late second and third centuries, and especially in the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian. A new, more historical, approach was made to the text of Minucius, resulting in a series of editions which can be broadly characterized as conservative.

Professor Pellegrino's new edition in the Corpus Paravianum belongs to this school, and future historians of scholarship may even bracket it with that of Josef Martin (Bonn, 1930, *Florilegium Patristicum*, fasc. 8), perhaps the most conservative of all. Again and again Pellegrino and Martin, sometimes joined by Miss A. Douglas Simpson (New York, 1938), retain the reading of P against most editors: e.g. 9. 3 *maxima et varia* (though they disagree on the interpretation, Martin placing a comma after *maxima*, Pellegrino after *veritas*), 11. 5 *culpam tamen vel innocentiam fato tribui sententiis plurimorum et haec vestra consensio*

est, 29. 3 *nec ille miserabilis*, 32. 5 *in sole* (cf. Valmaggi, *Riv. di Fil. Class.* xxxviii 1910, 557 ff.), 36. 1 *sit sortis fortunae*, etc.

Sometimes Pellegrino goes even farther than Martin in retaining readings of P: e.g. 16. 2 *procul est ab eius subtilitate simplicitate urbanitas* (*procul est ab eius simplicitate subtilis urbanitas* Martin, with a better clausula); 18. 4 *caelum terramque* (so also Douglas Simpson: Martin has *caelo terraque*); 18. 8 where Pellegrino does not follow most editors since Halm, including Martin, in adding *<tactu purior est>* from Cyprian *Quod idola* 9; 27. 1 *inspirantur* (Martin prints Heumann's conjecture *inspirant*); 32. 7 *deo cognita plena sint* (he takes *deo* as simultaneously dative and ablative: Martin reads *cognita, deo plena sint*); etc.

Yet it would be a mistake to see in Pellegrino's edition no reaction against the rigid and somewhat mechanical conservatism of Martin. Not infrequently he returns to the conjectures of earlier editors where Martin refused to emend: e.g. 14. 4 *<in> incredibili* with Balduinus and most editors, 23. 4 *loro Veneris* with Heraldus (*thoro* P *toro* Martin), 25. 4 *posteris* with Davies (*postremis* P Martin), 36. 2 *uberius* with Meursius (*verius* P Martin), etc. Furthermore, his attitude to the text of P even when he prints it is different from that of Martin. 'Non omnibus igitur locis', he says, 'quibus contra plerosque recentes editores aliosque doctos viros codicis lectionem servavimus eam procul dubio pro genuina habuimus; sed melius visum est textum nonnisi necessitate cogente immutare.' This caution is symbolized by the obeli with which he marks the well-known cruces in 20. 4, 20. 5, 22. 1, 22. 6, 26. 12, and by the lacuna which he postulates in 34. 2; in all but two of these passages (22. 6, where he admits that he is puzzled, and 26. 12, where he athetizes *procupidinem amoris*) Martin believed that he could understand the text which he printed.

It is perhaps unfair to blame an editor for inconsistencies which he evidently attributes to his author. Yet one wonders why Pellegrino prints in 5. 1 *repudiariis alterum, <alterum> comprobatis*, in 24. 11 *ridenda quam multa, <multa> etiam miseranda sunt*, while in 5. 4 he gives us the text of P *indignandum omnibus, indolenscendum (indignandum omnibus, <omnibus> indolenscendum* Vahlen): the three passages seem to stand or fall together.

I have observed only one misprint in the text, *hebeatur* for *hebetatur* in 32. 5, and one false attribution, in the critical note to 14. 4, where the reading attributed to Martin was first put forward by W. A. Bachrens, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax*, 246.

The preface summarizes clearly all that is known of the history of the text, and makes a useful classification of the errors of P.

Professor Pellegrino's edition is a worthy addition to the Paravia series. No doubt some of the doubts which arise in the reader's mind would be cleared up by reference to his commentary (Turin, 1947), which was unfortunately not accessible to me.

Dr. Quispel's edition with Dutch commentary is designed primarily for undergraduates. They will find the kind of help they need in the short notes, which consist mainly either of factual information or of translation, without comment, of difficult passages. There is perhaps too much of the latter for English taste.

Quispel has taken Martin's text as the basis for his own, and lists his divergences from it on pp. xiv-xvi. In general he returns to the conjectures of earlier editors in reaction against Martin's ultra-conservative adherence to P. In six passages he prints his own conjectures, viz. 25. 7 *set quos postulaverant*, 28. 6

si hoc et negotium daemonorum, 32. 7 *infra istam orbis provinciam*, 34. 2 *si desierint* ('dubitanter', he observes), 38. 3 *ut non sentienti facem ut sentienti coronam*, 38. 4 *<qui> quieti*. None of these is very attractive.

Unlike Professor Pellegrino, Dr. Quispel attempts to interpret the *locus conclamatus* at the end of chapter 21: I translate as closely as possible his Dutch translation; 'and he describes (*facit*) how from the discovery of the ears by Isis there arose the myth about the swallow and the sistrum and the empty grave of your (i.e. Caecilius)' honoured Serapis or Osiris, whose limbs are scattered'. Quispel is probably right in connecting this passage, as he does in his note, with Leo of Pella's euhemeristic explanation of the Isis-myth, preserved in Tertull. *de Corona* 7. But *facit* does not mean 'describe', and the translation ignores *ad*.

As a rule, however, he is sound and up to date in his interpretation. The book will be valuable to Dutch students. It is a pity that we have no comparable work in English.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

AUGUSTINE'S *DE MUSICA*

W. F. JACKSON KNIGHT: St. Augustine's *De Musica*. A Synopsis. Pp. 125. London: Orthological Institute, [1949]. Cloth and boards, 12s. 6d. net.

DESPITE the title, Augustine's *De Musica* deals exclusively with rhythm: melody was to have been the subject of a separate treatise, apparently never written. Of the six books only the last was revised. It was by this book, dealing with 'the ascent from rhythm in sense to the immortal rhythm which is in truth', that the author set most store; and in it still resides the greatest interest, because of the subtle psychology with which different manifestations of rhythm are distinguished. Books II-V elaborate a metrical theory upon numerical principles laid down in Book I. It is doubtful whether the modern student of metre can derive more profit from the *De Musica* than from other ancient treatises of comparable date. Though the author appeals now to authority, now to the ear, his system is to a large degree a construction of pure intellect, and impressive by its sheer ruthless pursuit of *a priori* reasoning. It is characteristic that, though Virgil and Horace are sometimes quoted, Augustine often prefers to improvise his illustrations, and that, in quoting *Aeneid* i. 1 as exemplifying (what we call) the penhemimeral caesura, he can state that this caesura is invariable ('*ab hoc uersu usque ad quem uolueris explora singulos*'), though the statement is slightly modified later. While his analyses of lyric metres are perhaps not more arbitrary than those of other late metricians, he admits, on numerical principles, many combinations which could not be illustrated from ancient poetic practice. It may well be that his rhythmical theories are more relevant to modern music than to ancient poetry; and Knight refers to an article by Mr. Ernest Newman (which I have not seen).

Of the *De Musica* Knight has made an abstract, eliminating the dialogue form, occasionally replacing connected sentences with tables, and adding a few brief comments (in square brackets). It was a service to make this interesting work of a great writer accessible to those who would be unlikely to look for it in Migne. I think it would have been a greater service, while putting in so much work, to make a job of it and publish a translation, particularly as the abstract

runs to some 40,000 words, compared with the 47,000 of the original. As it is, the student can get some idea of Augustine's theories and can mark down passages likely to interest him, but he would be unwise to depend too much upon the abstract, which is sometimes obscure (where the original is lucid) and not always correct. Knight would have done well to avoid, or put in square brackets, technical terms, e.g. arsis, thesis, caesura, acatalectic, which Augustine does not employ (and done better still to avoid 'Alexandrine' for iambic senarius). There are far too many misprints, many of them where they are most misleading—in the signs for long and short syllables.

Knight intends to edit the Latin text. Let us hope that he will pursue this project and include a translation and commentary.

Westfield College, London

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM

THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE

PENTTI AALTO: *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Tom. 62. 3.) Pp. 193. Helsinki: Druckerei-A. G. der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, 1949. Paper.

THE gerund and gerundive have been the object of two main kinds of inquiry, that of comparative linguistic into the affinities of the formans *-ndo-* and that of historical syntax into the original meaning and relation of the two forms. Aalto, after giving a brief history of his subject from antiquity to the present century, expresses a not unreasonable dissatisfaction with the results of the comparative method. Committed by his general thesis to rejecting theories requiring the priority of gerundive to gerund, he is equally doubtful of those which accept the gerund as prior. He is too summary in denying the possibility of explaining the *-nd-* as a metathesis and of thus connecting it with *-t-n-* and *-d-n-* elements common in Indo-European deverbative formations. Latin substantives in *-ndia*, *-ndo*, *-nda* and adjectives in *-undus* (*-endus*), *-cundus*, *-bundus*, though containing the same suffixal element, do not, he thinks, provide the starting-point for the explanation of the gerund and gerundive. He asserts obscurely that the coexistence of the three varieties *-undus*, *-cundus*, *-bundus* has no particular significance since other suffixes show a similar variation, e.g. *-ulo-*, *-culo-*, *-bulo-*. In many of these cases *c*, *b* represent I.-E. *t*, *dh*; does he then mean that *-cundus*, *-bundus* were analogically formed on *-undus* later than the consonant-changes in question? If so, what of their differences of meaning and function? In chapters iv and v, which classify the usages of the gerund and gerundive with selected examples from the earliest period to the Middle Ages, it is remarkable that almost no use is made of inscriptions. Aalto's view of the Oscan-Umbrian gerundive as borrowed from Latin is in harmony with the opinion of many scholars on the relation of Latin and O.-U., and his remarks on U. *pelsans futu*, etc., show how inadequate has been the treatment of these expressions. There follows the most important part of the book—the chapters dealing with the natures and origins of gerund and gerundive. From cases of the parallel use of gerund and substantive it is argued that the gerund is in origin a verbal noun, not a substantivized adjective. Its 'Notwendigkeitsbedeutung' is secondary and acquired in certain constructions by a process which Aalto exemplifies from

many languages, Indo-European and non-Indo-European. Here he is not careful to distinguish the two types of construction exemplified in English by 'he has to do some work' and 'he has some work to do'. The Vedic and Iranian examples are not apt, since in these the meaning of fitness or necessity is attached to the infinitive not through its construction but in virtue of its being in origin a substantive in the dative case; the same is true of the Hittite dative infinitive in *-anna*, and in the example quoted (p. 129) the modal sense is given also by the imperative *ešdu* 'esto'. He then shows that the gerundive, since it lacks degrees of comparison and forms no adverbs or substantives, is not likely to have been originally an adjective or participle, but can have arisen from the gerund in certain syntactical groups by a kind of mutual assimilation between the gerund and its object. Again the probability of the process is demonstrated from other languages. It must be admitted, however, that an incapacity for forming derivatives is not a cogent argument, since it applies also to participles *qua* participles and to the adjectives in *-bundus* and *-undus* (*-endus*) with few exceptions.

Out of many points of detail a few may be noted here. P. 62, ll. 3-4: Frontinus, *Aqu.* 11 does not exemplify the usage in question. P. 67, ll. 9 ff.: the hypothesis of an original distinction of meaning between *defessus faciendo* and *defessus facere* does not seem well supported by the examples. Aalto, quoting Plautus, *Epid.* 197, renders *defessus quaerere* by 'müde (weiter) zu suchen'; but Epidicus is pretending to be tired through having already sought Periphanes everywhere; see especially vv. 195, 200; cf. Prop. ii. 15. 45-6. P. 104, ll. 3 ff.: to the list of superlatives formed from gerundives add *uenerandissimus*. P. 113, ll. 17-18.: 'Der bloße Akkusativ (sci. der Gerundivkonstruktion) scheint nur in späterer Latinität . . . gebraucht worden zu sein'. What then is Aalto's opinion of *curare* with accus. and gerundive? P. 116, l. 17 and n. 3: does he mean to imply that the Iovilae-dedications are later than the Cippus Abellanus and the Tabula Bantina? P. 133, l. 8: for *stabiles* read *habiles*. P. 149, ll. 13-14: 'Das substantivische *-τέον* kann eine Umbildung eines ursprünglichen prädikativen Infinitivs auf **-τεται* sein'. Since this hypothesis implies an original construction **ἡ τύχη οἰοτέον ἐστὶ*, more than an 'Umbildung' is involved.

Dr. Aalto's arguments are not all equally convincing, but taken together they make a case well worthy of consideration. His copious examples and even more the statistical tables of pp. 172-4 imply a massive collection of material, the possibilities of which are clearly not exhausted in the present volume. It is much to be hoped that he will not permit this collection to remain idle henceforth.

Birkbeck College, London

D. M. JONES

LATIN COLOUR TERMS

J. ANDRÉ: *Étude sur les Termes de Couleur dans la Langue Latine*. Pp. 427. Paris: Klincksieck, 1949. Paper.

THIS work does not fulfil the hopes which its title arouses. An authoritative treatment of colour terms in Latin, which would enable us to read our authors with greater insight and enjoyment, would be a welcome and valuable contribution to classical studies. M. André offers us a book of 427 pages; he has an

impressive bibliography of modern literature and an abundance of quotations and references. Yet, despite the obvious care with which he has arranged and subdivided his material, the total impression, upon one reader at any rate, is confused. The reason for this lies in the mechanical approach which he has adopted; he appears to be using his instances with no more than a superficial knowledge of the contexts in which they occur, and at times not even with that.

The book has three main sections. After an introduction (pp. 7-21) in which André makes some sensible general observations, there follow (I) *Étude Sémantique* (pp. 23-204), (II) *Étude Lexicologique* (pp. 206-49), (III) *Étude Stylistique* (pp. 253-391), and finally a *Conclusion Générale*. There are six pages of bibliography and a collection of indexes, the latter very welcome in a work which will be chiefly used for reference purposes. (Yet one could have wished for perhaps the most useful index of all—an *Index Locorum*.)

The first section is by far the most valuable. In II and III there is much repetition and padding. All that they contain of value could have been either incorporated in section I under the appropriate colour or added in one or two short appendixes.

In section I the colours are treated, as André tells us, in their order of importance for the Romans. There are some good pages, especially the discussions of *ater* and *niger* and of *pallidus*. But, although he recognizes the unreliability of the poets as guides to an exact colour (e.g. pp. 122, 203, 280), he constantly uses poetic examples in his attempts to establish a particular shade. The truth is not merely that the poet tends to blur distinctions between related shades; that happens in colloquial speech. But the poet is prepared deliberately to employ colour terms which are *not* natural in order to heighten the dramatic or pictorial effect of his description. When Tennyson speaks of 'pilots of the purple twilight', the adjective is intended to suggest something strange and remote from the familiar world. The same is true of many passages in the Roman poets, not merely of those in which there is a pictorial contrast—an *opposition colorée*, as André calls it—but of texts such as Virg. *Aen.* i. 588 ff. (Aeneas invested with a supernatural beauty) or Tib. iii. 4. 23 ff. (description of a dream).

There are numerous details about which the reader will feel bound to differ from André. Many will doubt his belief (p. 78) that the adjectival suffix *-cundus* expresses greater intensity, rather than a permanent or characteristic quality. P. 34: in Cat. 80. 2 the words *candidiora niue* are not merely a poetic equivalent of *albissima*; Cat. is using the complimentary epithet ironically, as *rosea* in the previous line shows. P. 35: in Ovid, *Her.* 21. 217 *candida . . . ora* does not express *langueur passionnée*, which is described two lines earlier; the whole line describes the conventional pink and white of normal health (cf. Ov. *Met.* iii. 423). P. 111: André is surely wrong in attaching the sense of 'dark green' to *ferrugineus* in Plaut. *Miles* 1178-9. The colour is called *thalassicus* because it was the regular colour of sails (see W. Kroll's note on Catull. 64. 227). P. 113: in Ovid, *Am.* i. 12. 12 André evidently takes *sanguinolentus* as equivalent to *sanguineus* and referring merely to colour. The true sense of the passage is given by Némethy ad loc.: 'rubebas pariter ac si minio picta esses, sed re uera sanguine, non minio, eras infecta'. P. 315: discussing Ovid, *Met.* xiii. 889 ('fitque color primo turbati fluminis imbre') André explains the line as a *renouveau* of the conventional epithet *flauus*. But this misses the whole point; here is no periphrasis, but an admirable artistic touch in a passage which describes the transformation of

the blood of Acis into the stream bearing his name. It would be easy to multiply examples of this kind, in which the context has received too little attention. I add one further instance which well illustrates the inadequacy of a superficial and mechanical approach to these matters. On p. 312 André discusses some periphrases which, he claims, are due solely to metrical considerations. Let us take the one type *murice tinctus*, and look at the five texts to which he refers. Hor. *Epist.* ii. 2. 181: 'uestis Gaetulo murice tinctas'; Hor. *Od.* ii. 16. 36: 'te bis Afro | murice tinctae | uestiunt lanae'; Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 318: 'tunicas Gaetulo murice tinctas'; Mart. v. 23. 5: 'non nisi uel cocco madida uel murice tincta | ueste nites'; Mart. ix. 62: 'tinctis murice uestibus quod omni | et nocte utitur et die Philaenis'. Even if we grant that in the last passage *tinctis murice* is a purely metrical periphrasis (though he has put it under the wrong metrical pattern), the case is different with the other four texts. In three of them the periphrasis is due, not primarily to metrical convenience, but to the introduction of the picturesque local epithets, *Gaetulo* and *Afro*, whilst in the fourth *murice tincta* corresponds syntactically to *cocco madida*.

The contradictions which appear throughout the work create a disconcerting impression that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. On p. 85, in the phrase *arma cruento . . . auro rutilantia* (Sil. i. 477: 447 is a misprint) *rutilantia* is referred to blood, on p. 155 to gold. If André believed that both contributed to the colour, he should have said so. Similarly on p. 66 he refers to *Aen.* ii. 272 (not 722) (*aterque cruento puluere*) as an instance of *ater* applied to dust; on p. 328 he refers *ater* to blood, on p. 341 to dust again. On p. 328 Ovid, *Met.* xiii. 395 ('rubefactaque sanguine tellus | purpureum uiridi genuit de caespite florem') is given as a passage in which *purpureum* describes the colour of blood, but on p. 355 *purpureum* is attached to *florem* as a regular epithet. On p. 100, discussing *purpureus* as applied to the sea, he includes Cat. 64. 275 among a group of texts about which he says: 'Aucun de ces textes ne concerne la mer à l'aurore ou au coucher du soleil.' This is no accidental slip, for he goes on to discuss the passage in some detail, and concludes that what Catullus is describing is an 'éclat, rose peut-être, effet d'un jeu de lumière'. And yet in line 271, plain to see, are the words *aurora exoriente*. On pp. 152 and 335 the passage is correctly understood.

There are a number of inaccuracies due to sheer carelessness. For example, on p. 86 Silius xii. 648 depicts sunrise, not sunset; p. 342: in *Georg.* iii. 357 *pallentes . . . umbras* does not refer to the Manes; p. 343: Ovid, *Her.* ii. 72 should be referred to *niger*, and Virg. *Aen.* vi. (not iv.) 127 to *ater*; p. 347: Cat. 80. 1 has nothing to do with Aurora's hair; p. 361: Ovid, *Met.* xiii. 789 has nothing to do with milk or honey. But the worst appears on p. 194: 'cf. *A.A.* III, 177, *Hic* (sc. *uestis*) *undae imitatur, habetque nomen ab undis*'. Not only has André printed a line which will not scan (for *-que* read *quoque*), but he appears to think that *uestis* is masculine (for *uestis* read *color*). Both errors are repeated on p. 268.

Textual problems are virtually ignored; only once (p. 230, *atricolor*) have I found any reference to variant readings. Twice on p. 86 he cites Tib. ii. 5. 47 (*rutilis*) without mentioning the existence of *Rutulis*; on p. 109 the reader is not told that in Tib. i. 4. 43 the Ambrosianus has *picta*, not *picea*. In Manil. ii. 912 (p. 60) André accepts the reading *furuum*, and in Prop. iii. 13. 32 (p. 230) *uitricolor*, without any indication that the one is a conjecture of Bentley, and the other of Ellis. It is true that on p. 100, discussing the difficult *purpurea . . . niue* of *Eleg. in Maecen.* i. 62, he mentions Baehrens' *purpuream*, but Vollmer's *hyperborea*, for

which there is a good deal to be said (see his critical note, *P.L.M.*² i, p. 148), is ignored.

Finally, there is a large crop of false or inexact references. Some involve a discrepancy of only two or three lines, but many cannot be found without ingenuity and research. The following selection represents about one-fifth of those which I have noted in the poets alone. (I have made no attempt to verify the prose references.) The correct reference, where found, is added in brackets. P. 42, *argenteus*, *Ov. Her.* x. 71 (xviii. 71); p. 47, *ater*, *Ov. Her.* xii. 7 (xii. 67); p. 49, *atra nubes*, *Virg. Aen.* ix. 248 (iv. 248); p. 51, *bellum*, iii. 211 (insert 'Sil. It. '); p. 56, *niger*, *Hor. Od.* i. 27. 1 (i. 21. 7); p. 91, *purpura*, *Mart.* viii. 61. 8 (viii. 66. 8); p. 117, *coccinus*, *Ciris*, 196; *Mart.* iv. 29. 8 (*Ciris*, 169; *Mart.* ii. 29. 8); p. 134, *flavae . . . exuviae*, *Stace, Th.* 154 (insert iv.); p. 143, *pallore* *Perse*, v. 94 (iii. 94); p. 143, *uiridis pallor*, *Culex*, 225 (*Ciris*, 225: cf. p. 374); p. 152, *flammeum*, *Cat.* ii. 361 (*Luc.* ii. 361); p. 155, 294, *croceus*, *Juv.* 6. 365 (?); p. 215, *igneus*, *Virg. Georg.* i. 306 (i. 453; cf. p. 383); p. 228, *pallens*, *Lucr.* v. 549 (i. 123); p. 316, *niuei . . . ligustri*, *Ov. Met.* viii. 373 (xiii. 789); p. 344, *roseae habena*, *Val. Flacc.* i. 578 (*Sil. It.* i. 578); p. 353, *candida colla*, *Ov. Met.* ii. 457; ix. 388 (*Ov. A.A.* ii. 457; *Met.* ix. 388).

I wish that it had been possible to report more favourably on this book. As an interim study, it may be used with advantage by experienced scholars. But it must be emphasized that the field still remains open, and we still wait for an adequate treatment of this interesting and not unimportant subject.

University of Sheffield

ERIC LAUGHTON

ARCHAEOLOGY

WALTER OTTO and REINHARD HERBIG: *Handbuch der Archäologie*. Vierte Lieferung. (Müllers Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, VI. ii. 1.) Pp. xxiv+402; 95 text figs., 56 half-tone plates. Munich: Beck, 1950. Paper, DM. 45.

THE first volume of this handbook, published in 1939, besides general questions of archaeological sources, method, etc., covered the Palaeolithic Age, Egypt, and the Near East. The instalment under review (the first of vol. ii) covers the remains of the Neolithic and Bronze Ages down to c. 1000 B.C., in three parts: Europe and adjacent areas (including North Africa and the Caucasus, but excluding the Aegean), by O. Menghin; the Aegean, by F. Matz; and Italy, with Sardinia, Sicily, and Malta, by G. Kaschnitz-Weinberg. The third division also includes a section on the Early Iron Age, bringing the story down to historic times.

The interests of most readers of this *Review* probably lie mainly in the Aegean section; nor would the present reviewer be competent to judge the others. To such as he, however, it is valuable for comparative purposes to see so much of cultures outside the Aegean displayed in a handy compass. In the European part this is especially true of the section on buildings, covering the Neolithic and Bronze Ages together, which subdivides the remains typologically and is illustrated by some fifty figures. The other sections, on pictorial and decorative art, treat the two ages separately, with a geographical subdivision. It is a pity that this European part has no general *Fundortkarte* like the excellent ones for the Aegean and central Mediterranean areas, which are provided with both

alphabetical and numerical indexes. These are invaluable, for archaeologists are all too prone to assume that all the world knows as well as themselves the way to the holes they have dug.

General bibliographies are prefixed to each section of the work, and there are liberal footnotes. To catch up with the literature of the lost years of the war and after has of course been a problem: for the European part it is admitted that literature since 1941 has only occasionally been used; the central Mediterranean part was already in proof in 1933, and although many extra references have been inserted since then (mostly, it would appear, in footnotes), full use of the latest publications has not always been possible. Such omissions are due to events and circumstances beyond the control of the contributors; and the humane scholar will note them with sympathy, not blame. In any case, a handbook is concerned with the documented summarization of facts, and the lack of some recent references is therefore perhaps less serious than if its purpose were their interpretation to the 'general reader'. One who explores the literature of a particular topic with this *Handbuch* as his guide will be well equipped to continue his search through the recent journals under his own steam. Such I take to be the use of this book, at least in this country; for the student beginner will normally have a teacher's lectures to lead him to the sources, while others will use general works in English.

For the Aegean area, however, except for Crete, on which we have Pendlebury's admirable book, general works in English do not exist, or are out of date, and we must therefore be the more grateful for its excellent treatment in this volume. This part, originally written by G. Karo, was in proof in 1935, and in 1939 was thoroughly revised by F. Matz. The revision involved rearrangement, and the rewriting of some parts, especially on Crete; and we thus have virtually a joint work by two acknowledged experts. Though Professor Karo's name does not appear under the title, his knowledge and understanding of the pre-Hellenic world are still apparent in the text; and this may be said with no disparagement of Dr. Matz, who himself expresses the hope that this will be so. The list of addenda from post-1939 literature seems fairly comprehensive, and though the mere fact of printing something as an addendum must result in its missing its true place and proportion, such criticism fades in admiration of the thoroughness of the work as a whole. One might complain, for example, that the repercussions of Hammurabi's new date are only treated in a footnote; but after all, this question of absolute chronology is still *sub iudice*. It is more important that we do find here a brief and lucid criticism of the terminology of the Minoan periods as a whole.

Choice of illustrations for this type of work is difficult; and we must bear in mind that what is most suitable is not always readily available to the compiler—a difficulty that has been unusually acute in the last decade. A few of the photographs suffer by their small scale (a view of Troy, for example, and the blue monkey fresco from Knossos); one or two appear to be half-tones of half-tones (not, we may believe, by any wish of the publisher or author); and the original drawing of the inlaid silver cup from Dendra was not of the first class to begin with. L.H. III pottery is too sparsely represented (though the text covers it well); the two examples of Mycenaean ivory carving hardly suggest what fine art exists in this medium; and Minoan and Mycenaean script surely deserved some illustration, hard though it is to come by. But generally the pictures are clear and instructive.

No previous summary of the archaeological findings on the pre-Hellenic Aegean is anywhere near so complete as this. There is a good balance between documentation and the extraction of general inference, between the statement of fact and of accepted and current opinion, and it is always clear which is which. And if the reviewer may for the moment doff the guise of critic and say as a mere plodding reader of German that he has found the German more lucid than some, perhaps the remark will after all have some critical value.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

F. H. STUBBINGS

ANCIENT METALLURGY

R. J. FORBES: *Metallurgy in Antiquity*: A Notebook for Archaeologists and Technologists. Pp. 489. 98 ill. (half-tone, line, and diagrams). Leiden: Brill, 1950. Cloth, gld. 19.

The author is, I understand, a Dutch engineer; he has already published much valuable work on classical technology. The present book ranges far outside the classical field; perhaps the Dutch equivalent for our word 'Antiquity' has a wider connotation. At any rate the scope is world-wide, omitting only the processes initiated by scientific knowledge; the title should, in fact, have been 'Old-fashioned Metallurgy'. The available information consists, as the preface notes, of a mixture of facts and fancies; the facts are technical, and the author must be far more competent to interpret them than were most of the writers he cites, so that he is likely to have arrived at the meaning of quite a number of their fancies. But a high proportion of the sources must be susceptible of diverse explanation, whether because the data have overstepped the line between the fanciful and the fantastic, or are too jejune, or because of uncertainty as to the meaning of terms in dead languages. The first two difficulties apply to many of the classical sources, the last two especially to the ancient documents of Egypt and western Asia, but the use of archaeological evidence goes some way to make up the deficiency. Forbes has searched the excavation reports with comparative thoroughness as regards these countries, and has looked at others which deal with various sites in Europe. His archaeological and ethnological data for the world in general are extensive but mainly taken at second hand; this material is useful for comparison, but by no means complete in itself.

Any lengthy work on such a field would necessarily bear some resemblance to a scrap-book; in the present instance the tortured reader may be tempted to consider that the proper simile should be a scrap-heap. The thread of thought is looped and snarled by innumerable more or less relevant, more or less trustworthy, more or less explicable cuttings from writings of all the ages and about all the continents. But the book is far from being a mere scissors-and-paste compilation. It is a gigantic piece of research which fails to achieve its due consequence owing to disorderly presentation, and it reveals understanding of the past as well as knowledge of its metallurgical problems.

The English is perfectly comprehensible, though it might with advantage have been revised by some one who had acquired it as his native language; the occasional foreignness of a name may prove a hindrance (e.g. 'Pommeria', meaning Pomerania). There are surprisingly few printers' errors, but in a

number of cases they take the annoying form of transposition of letters in names (e.g. 'Agrar' for Argar, 'Buachi' for Bauchi). The illustrations tend to be too small for clarity. The references cited must run into many thousands. The index is selective; the entries are virtually limited to ancient or modern words for metals and processes.

A. W. LAWRENCE

ATHANATON IEPON GENOS AIEN EONTON

W. K. C. GUTHRIE: *The Greeks and their Gods*. Pp. xiv + 388. London: Methuen, 1950. Cloth, 21s. net.

THIS is neither a manual of mythology, nor a treatise on Greek religion generally, nor an account of Hellenic theology. Its limited aim is 'to serve as a kind of religious companion to the Greek classics' (p. vii), since to understand them, including the great masterpieces of philosophy, 'we must find out what we can about the beliefs of ordinary Greeks' (p. xii). Mr. Guthrie modestly hopes (p. 58), 'by covering a fairly wide field, to interest others in the subject of Greek religion and to suggest ideas which may bear fruit in other minds'. He has accomplished his task excellently, still within his self-imposed limits (he deliberately omits among other things the persistent rustic worship and the developments of Hellenistic times). After a very brief introduction and a first chapter which sketches the development of the study of classical religion, he treats in a series of chapters of 'the divine family', 'a central problem' (which is the more typically Greek attitude: the recognition of an unbridgeable gulf between human and divine or the aspiration to attain to some kind of likeness to, even union with, deity?), 'Gods and men in Homer', 'the contribution of Ionia', 'Dionysos', 'Apollo', 'Heaven and Earth', 'the Chthonioi', 'hopes and fears of the ordinary man', 'the Orphics', and finally 'Plato and Aristotle', the latter of whom gets two brief but good appendixes discussing some of the many difficulties in him. In all this it inevitably happens that a good deal is said which has been said before, generally at greater length. Mr. Guthrie is thoroughly sane and indulges in no wild speculations; nor does he differ from leading writers for the mere sake of controversy or would-be originality. But this is a characteristic shared by all sound handbooks, and it suffices to say that if one explanation of the facts is generally accepted, he gives it clearly and briefly; if there are two or three rival theories, he states them fairly, and the facts themselves are given at sufficient length in the text or the moderate apparatus of footnotes. Numerous good remarks are to be found up and down the book, as the insistence (p. 64) on the inconsistencies in Greek cult, which make it inevitable that there should be apparent inconsistencies in any account of it; the corollary to that, on p. 115 (for the living religion and its adherents 'many things which seem inconsistent to us conveyed no consciousness of inconsistency'); the sound protest against over-simplification on p. 206; the suggestion (p. 233) that the rise of cities which wanted guardian heroes to protect them had a good deal to do with the development of hero-cult; the plausible and probably right statement on p. 295 that originally there was no one abode of the Greek dead, but 'the dead of a particular locality went beneath the earth and stayed in the region where they died', descending by the local Hell-

mouth; the argument on p. 331 that Orphism did not originate at all events with the poorer strata of the population, who had no leisure to evolve complicated theological systems. I agree, and believe the same to hold good for a great variety of religious movements, as it is commonly true for political doctrines also. It does not follow that the adherents of Orphism were not for the most part persons who were ill-satisfied with their social and economic position in this world. Throughout, the tone of the work has that modesty and avoidance of over-confident statements which come from much knowledge of the subject and the attendant realization of its difficulties.

Since the author has several times referred to writings of mine, now assenting, now courteously disagreeing, I add here a mention of some few places where he seems mistaken on a small detail or where I think he has adopted the less likely view. On p. xiii, n. 2, it is not accurate to say that the drinking of the *kykeon* in the Mysteries commemorates the drinking of it by Demeter; the myth is as usual aetiological and secondary. P. 5 ought not to list the Keltic Dianus alongside Ianus as if he were his predecessor, philologically or in cult. P. 79, there is no such sound as *f* in classical Greek. P. 105 slightly misquotes Catullus lxiii. 91; it should be *domina Dindymeī*, not *Dindymene*. P. 124 has a miswriting or a misprint, *dmoos* for *dmōs*. P. 174 and elsewhere, (ἀπ)αθαρτιζειν means to confer, not to claim, immortality. P. 199, is there any real evidence that the Pythia went into such transports of possession as that of Virgil's Sibyl? On p. 238 Pausanias is quoted, but the reference (ii. 10. 1) accidentally omitted. Since Pheidippides is a comic name invented by Aristophanes and introduced by him as an invention (*Clouds* 60 ff.), is it not high time we called the famous runner by what was long ago pointed out as his real name, Philippides? Correct p. 252 accordingly. P. 275 n. 3, what evidence is there that the body of Klytaimestra is supposed to be 'unburied and dishonoured' in the *Eumenides*? On p. 274, for Fynnon read Ffynnon.

As to merely doubtful points, such as must abound in a book of moderate size, where it is impossible to argue everything at length, I select a few examples. P. 60, I doubt if the Palaikastro hymn 'abundantly proves' the survival of the Cretan cult of their so-called Zeus; it indicates it, certainly. In general, rather too much is allowed for survivals of this or similar deities as components of the classical Zeus, admittedly a complex figure. P. 103, I would distinguish between such rituals as the Attic Plynteria, in which a cult-image is treated like a living being and given a ceremonial bath, whether for cleanliness or ritual purification, and tales of the type recorded in Pausanias ii. 38. 2, of the annual miracle by which Hera in person, not her statue, bathed in the spring Kanathos and renewed her virginity. That there is some kind of connexion is arguable, but from that to identity is a long step. On p. 130 I would decidedly deny that in Homer, or Epic tradition generally, Moira is, or the Moirai are, a power superior to the gods. The Moirai are indeed superior to Zeus in Aeschylus (*P.V.* 516), but in Homer μοῖρα seems to be simply the 'portion' assigned by Zeus or the gods generally, and so his or their instrument, however ineluctable to mortals. On p. 234, n. 2, it is very far indeed from 'almost certain' that the words εὐμορφον κράτος in Aesch. *Cho.* 490, imply any desire that Agamemnon 'may rise again in bodily form to wreak his own vengeance'. He cannot, and his children know it, for his body has been mutilated by the slayers (439), and therefore the most that can be expected is that he will exercise some kind of invisible and ghostly 'oversight' (489).

Persephone is asked to send 'comely victory', and doubtless Elektra would have said, if asked afterwards, that her prayer was answered. Lawson, who is quoted in the note, is an unreliable guide to parallels between ancient and modern Greek belief.

Having written two good books on Greek religion, Mr. Guthrie, it is to be hoped, will go on to write more, since he knows very well how far the subject is from exhaustion and how much room is to be found for a reasonable and well-equipped controversialist.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

TRADITION AND PROTO-HISTORY

ALBERTO GITTI: *Mythos: la Tradizione pre-storiografica della Grecia*. Prolegomeni allo studio delle origini greche. (Studi Barese di Storia e di Filologia, Vol. I.) Pp. xx+275. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1949. Paper.

THIS is a careful study, inspired ultimately by Beloch, for whom the author has a great but not uncritical admiration, of the value to be attached to the accounts given by the Greeks themselves of the doings of their ancestors during the seven or eight centuries preceding the first faint dawning of something like reliable documented history. The conclusions are thus summed up by the author (p. 257): 'Una tradizione c'è dettagliatissima per l'era fino alla migrazione dorica, che viene poi a mancare dopo questo evento, ma questa tradizione, basata com'è *esclusivamente* sul mito e sulla poesia epica e teologico-sacerdotale, è *totalmente* privo di valore, per cui la storia di quest'età, che manca di documenti genuini ed attendibili, si deve costruire tutta su altre basi.' The italics are mine, and indicate what I think the weaknesses and exaggerations marring a result on the whole sound and well reasoned.

His argument is briefly this. Our earliest source for the traditional history of the Greek 'middle ages', between the bloom of the Mycenaean culture and the beginnings of reasonably certain history, is Homer, whom he rightly places in the tenth century B.C., although he makes large concessions to the remnants of separatism, including the curious theory that the Catalogue of the Ships (p. 87) is late, a proposition quite independent of the disbelief in its having originally formed part of the *Iliad*; he mentions in his bibliography, but does not sufficiently appreciate, Allen's standard work on the subject. Now Homer is a poet and not a historian, and he has no difficulty in showing, with illustrations from the *Chanson de Roland*, the *Nibelungenlied*, and literary Italian epic how widely a poet may vary from historical fact (pp. 118 ff.). Therefore, since the contents of Homer's works are 'mythical' (he does not sufficiently distinguish myth from saga, although he is aware of the difference, pp. 131 ff.), no kernel of fact can be extracted from them, not even that the Trojan war was really considerable and was fought out between Agamemnon's and Priam's followings. He has little difficulty in showing that the post-Homeric epics and the works of the Hesiodic school are if anything still less trustworthy (chaps. iv and v). Here, incidentally, he unnecessarily introduces a controversial and, as I think, quite mistaken idea, that priestly influence radiating from some of the principal shrines had a good deal to do with Hesiodic theology (p. 205). I also completely disagree with his ascription of the *Theogony* to some unknown

poet, later than Hesiod himself (pp. 87, 205), a theory which of course is not exclusively his. In all this, as it seems to me, he exaggerates a truth. It is quite hopeless to extract from Homer or any of the Greek epics anything like a precise account of the events of the Heroic Age; we cannot, for instance, be certain that even so important a character as Hektor is not the poet's own invention. Nevertheless, a study somewhat more extensive than Gitti's of the way in which saga is handled in popular and semi-popular literature will, I think, lead to the conclusion that events which impress their own and the following generations are remembered and told with a degree of truth as regards the central facts which is often surprising. The kernel of fact is there, though opinions may justly differ as to its exact content and size.

Gitti is rather kinder to non-literary traditions such as genealogical and other lists; for example, he will not assume (pp. 323 ff.) that the first fifty Olympiads are purely or chiefly invented by Hippias of Elis. When he points out (p. 201) that family pride and political interests are great corrupters of genealogies, he is right, but he forgets that the chronological tables which were later compiled from such sources could and probably did check one genealogy by another and thus got rid of at least many of the more blatant inventions. Regarding non-Greek sources, to which he very properly looks for light, he maintains a wise reserve, in view of our very imperfect knowledge of Hittite philology, concerning the views of Forrer and his critics (pp. 151 ff.). Space forbids the discussion of a number of minor points which do not affect his main argument.

The proof-reading has not been well done; some, but by no means all, misprints are corrected in a page of errata.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

LITTLE GODS BUT VERY WISE

BENGT HEMBERG: *Die Kabiren*. Pp. 420; 4 maps. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1950. Paper, 25 Sw.kr.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation, distinguished from the general run of such things not only by its size and very considerable learning but by the maturity of judgement which the author shows. He plainly is a man of strong good sense, who can examine and analyse facts and go where they lead him, but refuses to take any of the tempting opportunities afforded by his chosen subject of building airy hypotheses on weak foundations, a fault to which students of the puzzling cults he investigates have in the past been far too prone. Hence his conclusions are often tentative, often negative, frank admissions that we do not know enough, perhaps never shall know enough, to give a satisfactory answer to this or that curious problem; but they are seldom of a kind likely to need radical revision. The only indication of immaturity, or rather of lack of practice in the material side of authorship, is that the proof-correcting has been none of the best, an inserted slip putting right some but by no means all of the errors, whether Hemberg's own or due to the printer.

The matter handled is wider than the title would indicate, for Hemberg does not treat only of the Kabeiroi (or Kabiroid) but of several groups of vague deities who more or less resemble them and are known to have been worshipped in one part or another of the Greek world. The maps illustrate clearly the extent to which these cults overlapped each other.

There are seven main chapters, grouped into four of analysis and three of synthesis. The former discuss in order those Megaloi Theoi who are not Samothracian and not Kabeiroi, then the Kabeiroi themselves, then the Samothracian gods, next the groups of deities of unknown name who may be considered as *Kabirenähnlich*. The latter bear the titles *Kennzeichen der Megaloi Theoi*, *Die den Megaloi Theoi und ihren Verwandten gemeinsamen Eigenschaften*, and, the briefest, *Zusammenfassung*. There are also an Introduction of moderate length and six interesting appendixes discussing problems of detail and, in the last and longest, tabulating a number of characteristics of these curious beings and pointing out which are to be found and which, so far as we know, are lacking in particular groups. Bibliography, indexes, and special bibliographies prefixed to sections of the work are furnished, the result being that the monograph is very handy to use.

When all the material is collected, the main results seem to be as follows. There were worshipped on Samothrace and in a not inconsiderable area influenced by it, mostly in Hellenistic times, a group of deities known collectively as Great, but apparently never as Kabeiroi, at all events by their own initiates. There were cults of Kabeiroi in several places, one of the best known being Thebes. There were also sundry other groups known by collective names, sometimes quite independent of Samothracian divinities and Kabeiroi alike, sometimes tending to be identified with them. These often, indeed characteristically, include the Dioskuroi; it seems rather the exception than the rule for them to be distinguished from either the Samothracians or the Kabeiroi. Apart from the Dioskuroi themselves, it seems impossible to find, for any group, any consistent account generally accepted in antiquity of their names, number, sex, or functions, although it is quite common for them to include one or more female figures and to be concerned with fertility. The names of several groups are very doubtfully Greek (for example, for the Kabeiroi themselves Scaliger's old Semitic etymology has never been confuted), and neither the name nor even the ethnological origin is of first-rate importance for the study of them. They lie outside the main stream of mythology, literature, and, generally speaking, of the interests of the higher and more articulate classes of society.

Hemberg might, I think, have drawn a tentative conclusion concerning them all without building cloud-castles. These worships seem to represent an early, one might perhaps say a first, step beyond the idea of *mana* which has left faint traces in Greece and much clearer ones in Rome. Divine power being supposed present, it would not take long to conclude that there must be agents to whom this power belonged. The quicker and more inquiring minds among the Greeks soon asked who these agents might be, and so in time constructed those clear-cut figures, with their elaborate attendant myths, which are so familiar in the classical pantheon. But the slower-witted or less inquisitive were content to feel that there were such powers, to ask them for help where it was most needed (hence the insistence on fertility of the earth or of living things, and, particularly when the cult was on an island among dangerous seas, on help in times of peril, not least from storms), and so gradually to get some idea of what manner of beings they might be supposed to be, e.g. givers of fertility, therefore themselves fertile, therefore of both sexes and various ages. Parallel to this, or preceding it, would come such rites as the sacred marriage which apparently formed part of the Samothracian ceremonial.

Of mistakes of fact or certainly wrong interpretations there are few, if any,

that I have detected. Points of disagreement exist here and there, but are matters of small detail, not worth listing. The book is a real contribution to our understanding of an important subject, the feelings and incoherent ideas of the little people of antiquity, including the unprivileged and the unfree.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

MAGICAL AMULETS

CAMPBELL BONNER: *Studies in Magical Amulets, chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*. Pp. xxiv + 334; 25 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, £5 net.

PROFESSOR CAMPBELL BONNER's long-awaited monograph on a subject in which he has made himself a leading authority forms vol. xlix of the University of Michigan's Humanistic Series. It is the fruit of intense and minute study of objects which are easy neither to come at, nor to examine in detail, nor to classify, and the reviewer is distressed to learn (preface, p. ix) that this has weakened the learned author's eyesight. So far as a non-specialist can judge, the 397 specimens which are shown on the plates and meticulously described on pp. 253-323 are judiciously selected from the far larger number known to exist. Of the others, some were not to be had, nor reproductions of them by photography or other processes to be got under present conditions. The graceful acknowledgements on pp. xi-xiii indicate that at least on his own continent and in western Europe the writer met with the courtesy he deserved from other men and institutions of learning. But for his too great modesty in asking for help he might have had more specimens to illustrate and discuss.

The practice of wearing or carrying on the person some small object supposed to bring luck, repel disease, ward off dangers, or hurt an enemy seems to be world-wide and of prehistoric origin. But in Graeco-Egyptian magic especially, not to mention other regions of the ancient civilizations, it took an elaborate development, the objects, often supposedly virtuous by reason of their material, being reinforced by figures, holy names, and all manner of words of power, and quite a high degree of specialization seems to have been reached. Bonner distinguishes fifteen main types, differentiated partly by what can be guessed of their functions, partly by the kinds of figures or inscriptions carved upon them, and having given a chapter to each, he adds another on those which are 'unusual, obscure, and problematical'. Throughout, he protests, with good reason, against calling the amulets Gnostic, unless indeed that word is used so loosely as to include any and every system, or superstition, which professes to base itself upon knowledge got from a supernatural source and not by ordinary processes of observation and reasoning. Formally, this part of his work might be said to suffer from cross-classification, but the arrangement is intelligible enough. Here and there he could have saved himself some trouble by using Nilsson's excellent article, 'Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri' (Lund *Årsberättelse* for 1947-8), but probably it did not reach him in time.

In discussing the many thorny problems arising from the symbols and inscriptions on the amulets, Bonner shows consistent sanity as well as thorough scholarship. He refuses, for instance, to be led into attributing more than a

proper share of influence to Iranian religion (pp. 32 ff.), Judaism (*passim*), even Egyptian cult and mythology (p. 8). In dealing with the numerous pieces of sorcerers' jargon which occur on amulets as on magical papyri, he notes from time to time plausible derivations of the strange forms from languages other than Greek, such as Coptic, Aramaic, and so on, but will not wander off into by-paths of improbable speculation. Rather does he emphasize, and with justice, the effect on the emotions of mere sounds, the more unintelligible the better: 'One must allow for some pretense and even knavery . . . yet it is probable that the chanting repetition of sonorous, mouth-filling vocables may have produced a genuine emotional impact upon the magician as well as upon those who listened to him' (pp. 190 f.). When he treats of the monstrous figures which adorn or mar so many amulets, he is never afraid to say plainly that he has no sufficient explanation of them (chapter ix, where incidentally he mentions one amulet that has a real claim to be considered Gnostic in the proper sense, pp. 135 ff.).

Other specialists on this strange and interesting pseudo-science (or art) will no doubt join issue with him on sundry technical points. I mention a few small matters of a more general nature. On pp. 43 f. more might have been said of the use of the story in magic. On p. 165, when discussing the headless god, he might have made use of the modern Sicilian cult of the *decollati*.¹ Considering how important a *βιαιθάνατος* is in magic, it seems at least worth suggesting that one element in this strange figure is the ghost of a beheaded criminal, conceived as powerful and dangerous. On p. 78 there was no need to emend the vulgar form *φυλακτήριον* to the literary *φυλακτήριον*. On p. 162, note 38, he points out that the jargon-word *Ermithouth* 'looks like a combination of the names *Hermes* and *Thoth*', but is inclined to dismiss as 'merely a coincidence' the fact that it is an anagram of the name of the snake-goddess *Thermouthis* in the vocative case. I see no reason why it should not be both at once. One point raised on p. 88 I discuss elsewhere.²

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

EARLY CIVILIZATIONS

Peuples et Civilisations: Histoire Générale: I. Les premières civilisations. Par P. JOUGNET, J. VANDIER, G. CONTENAU, E. DHORME, A. AYMARD, F. CHAPOUTHIER, R. GROUSSET. xi + 765; 4 maps. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950. Paper, 1200 fr.

THIS is a new edition, completely rewritten and with new contributors, of a book which appeared in 1926 as the first volume of a general history by many hands. It covers the same ground as the first three volumes of *C.A.H.* and part of the fourth, the history of the ancient world to the Persian Wars. Little need be said here—and the present reviewer is not competent to say it—on the sections dealing with Egypt and the kingdoms of Asia, which are the work of acknowledged masters; one may offer a compliment on the skill with which the different contributions fit into one another. About a third of the space is given to Greece and the Aegean. M. Chapouthier deals briefly and sensibly with

¹ See E. S. Hartland in *Folk-Lore*, xxi (1910), pp. 168-79.

² *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xlv (1951), 59.

the prehellenic period. He is right in a general work to be sceptical of hypotheses more exciting than sound, but it is a pity that he does not refer to the effects in central and western Europe of the Mycenaean expansion, for these are well established and of the utmost historical importance. He writes also on the Dorian invasion and the migrations to Asia Minor, and here formulates certain principles with admirable clearness: the distinction, in archaeological terms, between new customs introduced at the period of the Dorian invasion and those directly due to the Dorians (of which he allows only the wearing of spectacle-fibulae); the importance of military factors in the formation of the institutions of the Greek, and specifically Dorian, city-state. M. Aymard writes on archaic Greece. The line of division is the beginning of the colonizing period, and it is as well drawn here as anywhere; his account dovetails skilfully and, let us say, historically, into that of his predecessor.

There is no full-length history of archaic Greece, in any language commonly read by students in this country, which takes into account the discoveries of the last twenty years. M. Aymard's account has, therefore, an importance for the student of Greek history, apart from its value as part of the universal history to which it belongs. It may serve both purposes well. It gives what is probably as near as can be an 'accepted' history. It does not chase after the latest ingenious hypothesis but shows knowledge of the more substantial of them. It is not afraid of expressing ignorance, and indicates the flimsiness of some of the material. And it is agreeably written. It may be recommended as a sensible account of the present state of knowledge of early Greek history, within its limits of space (some 220 pages) and documentation (few footnotes, but useful short bibliographies to each section of a few pages). The Greek part of the book is completed by a brilliant chapter, from M. Chappouhier's pen, on archaic Greek civilization, literature, and art.

A few words in criticism. M. Aymard's approach—traditionalist tempered by scepticism—appears typically in his account of early Sparta. Lycurgus is treated, in effect, as a legendary hypostasis of the early institutions of Sparta. These institutions are, for M. Aymard, original, and he accepts the introduction of the ephorate as a political institution under Theopompus and the rider to the Lycurgan *rhetra* of the same period. Of the *rhetra* itself he says only 'Le texte, bref et obscur, qui paraît le plus ancien, une *rhetra* ('ordre') rendue, disait-on, par l'oracle de Delphes, mentionne l'assemblée, un conseil et deux rois.' The delicately expressed scepticism about the Delphic origin of the *rhetra* might have given place to a more forceful expression of disbelief, for whatever *rhetra* means, it is not 'oracle'. And more might have been said of the difficulties which this document arouses if it is assigned to the eighth century or earlier—apart from surprise at the appearance of a sovereign assembly so early, nothing more is said about its form or content. On the other hand, the account of sixth-century Sparta offers a firm and clear picture of the gradual stiffening of Spartan life, which is rightly shown to have taken full effect only much later than used to be supposed.

It is surprising to find the myth of early Ionian primacy still expressed here, though in a moderate form. R. M. Cook's paper in *J.H.S.* 1946 (not apparently available to M. Aymard) should have dealt the death-blow to this myth; and, for material civilization, G. M. A. Hanfmann's important paper in *A.J.A.* 1948, 135 ff. enforces the conclusion that Ionia did not lie at the end of a long land route across Hither Asia along which travelled the Oriental influences

so vital in Greek art and civilization between c. 750 and 600. M. Aymard has not so much as a mention of al Mina, the Greek bridge-head on the Syrian coast which was no doubt the main starting-point of the alternative, more practical, sea route from East to West. Al Mina does not answer all the questions about the early relations of Greece and the Orient, but any account which ignores the finds there and Sydney Smith's paper on them in *Ant. Journ.* 1942 ignores the few facts which we possess, in favour of *a priori* theories.

M. Aymard has gone astray in a few archaeological points: for instance, Eretrian pottery is unimportant (p. 499); it is certain that the Cypselids did *not* construct the temple of Apollo at Corinth, whose building began about 540 B.C. (p. 505; see Weinberg, *Hesperia*, viii. 191 ff.; Robertson, *History of Greek and Roman Architecture*², 326). In general, however, his handling of archaeological evidence is sound and apposite.

All Souls College, Oxford

T. J. DUNBABIN

GREEK CITY-STATES

KATHLEEN FREEMAN: *Greek City-States*. Pp. xx+286; 9 maps and plans. London: Macdonald, 1950. Cloth, 15s. net.

IN this book Dr. Freeman's aim is to illustrate 'the immense and fascinating diversity existing within the Greek world'. She has therefore selected nine city-states, disparate in size and in situation, and has devoted one chapter to each. As the book is intended for the general reader rather than for the specialist, a brief introduction traces the rise and fall of the independent Greek city-state and poses the question, 'What is the moral of this tragic story?' The final chapter suggests the answer that the Greek city-states failed to settle their internal differences by peaceful means and to avoid inter-state wars, because their governments were actuated by immediate self-interest, and that the remedy for their discord was to be found in education and particularly in development of the imagination. This judgement on Greek history is passed as a modern one: it might be in the interest of the general reader to mention that it was also passed by Plato and even by Isocrates, whom Dr. Freeman dismisses rather curtly as 'a sentimental doctrinaire'. When we turn to the description of the nine city-states, it is apparent that the connexion between the general aspects of Greek history and the particular details of the description is tenuous.

Of Thurii too little is known to permit of a consecutive detailed study. Inevitably such data as the bleaching properties of the river Crathis, the idiosyncrasies of Hippodamus, and the list of distinguished visitors to Thurii—Alcibiades, Gylippus, Dorieus, Philistus, etc.—are mere incidents in an almost random series which justifies Aristotle's censure of history in the narrow sense. With Acragas we reach more noble remains in stone, in verse, and in great deeds; for the builders of the temples and the heroes of Pindar's odes belong to the generation which defeated the Carthaginian menace, and their successors, Dexippus, Dionysius, and Timoleon, carried on the tradition of independence. Here, too, there are many disjointed episodes such as Gellias' winebins, the wedding of Antisthenes' daughter, and the depredations by Verres, but the narrative is swift and the stories well told. Corinth affords a wider canvas. Dr. Freeman begins with Jason, Medea, and Sisyphus, and ends in the fifth

century A.D. with the reign of Justinian. Her opinion, that 'Corinth was the only city-state in Greece where the craftsman was held in higher esteem than the soldier', would surely have outraged the fifth-century Corinthian: 'there dwells the sweet-breathed Muse, there, too, Ares flourishes with the deadly spearpoints of young warriors' (Pindar, *Ol.* xiii. 22-3). The narrative of innumerable wars extending into Roman times bulks large in the text. There are good descriptions of the layout of the city in different periods, and there are many stories in the Hellenistic vein which illustrate the luxury of the Corinthians. But the political genius of archaic Corinth, whereby she created a colonial system of unusual solidarity and almost a monopoly of sea-borne trade to the west, receives less attention than it deserves in a book of which the aim is to illustrate the diversity of Greek genius.

The remaining chapters (dealing with Miletus, Cyrene, Seriphos, Abdera, Massalia, and Byzantium) possess the same merits and defects as the chapters which have been described. The narrative moves easily from episode to episode with pleasant digressions on famous visitors and with apt descriptions of colourful scenes and ancient monuments. The geographical setting of each city-state is attractively set out, with quotations from ancient geographers and with sketch-maps of a simple kind. There is a select bibliography and a full index of proper-names, and the book is well printed. The general reader will enjoy this book as light and attractive reading, but it is to be doubted whether he will gain any clear insight into those political, artistic, and intellectual qualities which have made the history of Greece as a whole and the history of individual city-states worthy of our serious attention.

Clare College, Cambridge

N. G. L. HAMMOND

CONSTITUTIONS

HEINRICH RYFFEL: *METABOLH POΛITEIΩN*, *Der Wandel der Staatsverfassungen*. Pp. 278. Bern: Paul Haupt, 1949. Paper, 16 Sw. fr.

THE classification of constitutions and the examination of the processes whereby they succeed one another are basic in ancient political theory; in their particular aspect of study as the succession of forms of organized community (*μεταβολαὶ πολιτειῶν*) these questions are the subject of this monograph. Manifestly it owes a great deal to a very large literature on political theory in Greece which the author has read and assimilated; in the nature of things its value must lie in the organization and disposition of the material and the development of established ideas rather than in any original contribution of great moment to what is in effect one aspect of the whole problem of the State, ideal and real, its origins and fate. From the standpoint of summarizing the views, ancient and modern, on this aspect of political theory in antiquity it can perform a useful service.

The author in his sixth and last chapter (it would have been better placed as the first) explains the inception of his studies from Cicero's 'orbes et quasi circuitus in rebus publicis commutationum et vicissitudinum' (*de re publ.* i. 29. 45), carried of necessity to Cicero's Greek teachers: first to Polybius and his *πολιτειῶν ἀνακύκλωσης* and the biological theory of the 'cycle' (vi. 9. 10 *αὐτῇ φύσεως οἰκονομία, καθ' ἣν μεταβάλλει καὶ μεθίσταται καὶ πάλιν εἰς αὐτὰ καταστᾶ τὰ*

κατὰ τὰς πολιτείας) with all its attendant problems, and so farther back again to examine the idea of change and succession of constitutions in Aristotle, Plato, and the Sophists. This backwards development has obviously left its mark on the work. If a general criticism may be made it is that the author has undertaken a good deal more than can be managed in a book of this size, so that the treatment of important elements, as, for example, the chronology of the *Politics*, the composition of Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, and the relation of Polybius to the Stoics, leaves something to be desired.

After an introductory chapter Ryffel proceeds by way of the Seven Sages and a few general observations on early political ideas to Solon, for whom he finds the principle of μεταβολή represented in the idea of δυσνομία and the moral decline leading to civil strife and tyranny; present also is the idea of the avoidance of disaster through the mean between extremes, but Ryffel warns us against regarding this mean as a mixture in the sense of later ideas of a mixed constitution. Some development of the later (5th–4th cent.) attitudes to Solon and his reforms would not have been out of place here and in the discussion of Aristotle's views. Then, starting from Hippodamus of Miletus (Aristotle's first theorist on the ideal constitution), Ryffel passes on to the circle of Pericles and to Damon in particular, and so to the Sophists, especially Protagoras, to discuss the views current in the second half of the fifth century, as a preliminary to a consideration of Plato and Aristotle. Here Protagoras plays, in Ryffel's opinion, a considerable part in the development of ideas of μεταβολή, for linked with the causes of decline and its remedies are the conditions and causes of the evolution of human society: Protagoras is perhaps the one to whom is to be ascribed the combination of doctrines of social and moral development and of constitutional decline and change, which is apparent in Plato and Polybius. It seems a great pity that Ryffel did not have an opportunity of studying J. S. Morrison's work on Protagoras (*C.Q.* xxxv. 1–16), in which Morrison also discusses the important passage of Herodotus (iii. 80 ff.) which deals with the question of the best of three constitutional forms—a passage discussed at length by Ryffel as part of the μεταβολή theory in Herodotus.

In sections 2–4 (the last dealing with Thucydides) of chapter ii Ryffel studies this vital and most interesting period without any real consideration of the historical background, which seems a pity. How far the development of these ideas can thus be kept apart from contemporary affairs is a point to be considered, especially in view of the fact that at this stage he begins to elaborate the distinction between the approach from 'above', from the standpoint of the ruler, which sees decline arising from the 'moral degeneration of the rulers' (*ethischnormisierende Theorie*), and the approach from 'below' from the standpoint of the ruled (its first beginning in the idea of the προστάτης of Herodotus iii. 82. 4), which seems to entail the further distinction between the ideal approach and the empirical 'der sich in der Vielfalt der Erscheinungen orientieren, der die Welt der Erfahrung sichten will'. This latter approach gives rise to complex observations on constitutional development, an historical development, as opposed to Plato's 'inner logic' of constitutional change. Making this distinction Ryffel then proceeds to deal with μεταβολή and its implications in Plato (iii) and Aristotle (iv), where, however, the peculiar position of Aristotle, which Ryffel has already emphasized, seems inadequately explained. So too, when he passes on to Polybius (v), his attempts to show how the doctrines of Book vi were contributed to by earlier thought (including the idea of

ἀνακύκλωσις from the process γένεσις—ἀκμή—φθίσις) are, even allowing for the difficulty of the subject, involved and obscure, and no clear picture emerges of what Ryffel is seeking to show.

As has been already mentioned, a good deal of the difficulty seems to arise from the scope of the work, involving problems which could hardly be treated in the space available: the position and influence of Protagoras and Antiphon, Aristoxenus on Plato, the authorship and composition of both works entitled *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, the light which might be obtained from a consideration of the Attic drama (cf. *C.Q.* xxxv. 13-15), the chronology of the *Politics*, the question of the composition of Polybius vi, the significance for the present subject of the *Anonymus Iamblichi* and of the work *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως* ('Ocellus Lucanus').

Nevertheless, though too much has been attempted for proper discussion, that is not to say that the author has not deserved well in tracing the development of these important ideas from their origins in Greece to their exposition in relation to Rome. The argument is supported by a wealth of footnotes, disproportionate at times, and supplemented by a number of appendixes, treating of the relevant terminology in Solon, Herodotus, and Thucydides, *μεταβολή* as a *τόπος* of political rhetoric, the idea of *σύμφυτον κακόν*, and Hesiod's *Generations of Man*. The bibliography is overwhelmingly German; work in English is represented by Barker and W. L. Newman (A. E. Taylor seems to be known only indirectly). This may be in part due to the Second World War, but cannot be wholly so. There are few misprints; references, as far as they have been checked, are accurate. It may be noted, as possibly an index of the flourishing state of Classical Studies in Switzerland, that the author appears to be a teacher in the Gymnasium of Biel, the municipal authorities of which town particularly assisted in the publication of this work.

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

THE MEDITERRANEAN CIVILIZATION

E. KORNEMANN: *Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeer-Raumes von Philip II. von Makedonien bis Muhammed*. Pp. xvi+508, viii+563; 40 maps, 12 portraits. Munich: Biederstein, 1948-9. Cloth, DM. 60.

If we turn from the somewhat ambiguous title of this book to its preface, we there read that its purpose is to show the magnitude and variety of the contribution to Mediterranean, and so to European, civilization, of the Iranians, and to emphasize that they should hold rank alongside the Greeks as pioneers of progress in the ancient world. If we pass on to the text, we find that it is mainly taken up with a running narrative of Greek and Roman history from Philip of Macedon to Heraclius, with an introductory chapter on Achaemenid Persia and two concluding chapters which carry on the record to that *ultimus Romanorum*, the emperor Frederick II.

As a pupil of Mommsen, the late Professor Kornemann had a keen sense of values and wielded his pen with epic zestfulness. Now and then in this book he has pitched his note too high. Agathocles is presented as an 'excellent statesman' and the hegemon of a Sicilian confederacy. Again, we read that in Ptolemaic times seaborne trade with India attained such a scale that this

sub-continent 'was shifted into the centre of world-interest'. (For a less dazzling picture see Claire Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides*, p. 359.) Under the late Roman Republic the turn-over of the *publicani* was huge enough to make them masters of the State. (The facts and figures in Tenney Frank's *Economic Survey of Rome* tell another story.) Caesar's projected war with Parthia was to 'annihilate' her. Under Septimius Severus all departments of state became *encanaillés*. (This in the days of 'classical' Roman jurisprudence.) Diocletian's hesitant persecution of the Church is satanized into a ruthless ideological drive. But Kornemann is free from his master's bitterness and psychological obtuseness, and although at times he hits out rather wildly he also has the courage (none too common among historians) of frank admiration.

In bracketing the Iranians with the Greeks, Kornemann derives his best argument from the fact that Islamic culture, which had an appreciable influence on European art and literature and science, was itself largely derived from the Abassid conquerors of the original Moslem lands. Furthermore, if his contention holds true that the post-exilic Jews drew heavily on the doctrine of Zarathustra, the importance of this fact for European history will be obvious; but other scholars maintain that here we have a case of parallel development. Kornemann's claim that Darius I was the pioneer of efficient imperialism (based on centralization and bureaucracy) hardly does justice to the Pharaohs (particularly those of the Eighteenth Dynasty); and it leaves the reader to explain as best he may how a loose rabble of Greek cities contrived to knock Xerxes' model army silly. His thesis is also weakened by the admission that the Achaemenid Empire (like the Parthian and Sassanid realms to follow) rendered down to a sprawling feudalism. But he makes amends to the Greeks with his handsome acknowledgement that the greatest achievement of the Caesars was to make Europe safe for Hellenic culture.

In spite of his preface, however, Kornemann's work must be mainly judged by his chapters on Greece and Rome, which occupy by far the greater part of his book. Occasional remarks by him on Graeco-Roman art and literature reveal a discerning interest in these subjects; yet they amount to little more than *obiter dicta*. He writes at greater length on economic matters and makes some telling extracts from Rostovtzeff's two great social histories; but he shows no acquaintance with the quantitative and statistical material provided in Tenney Frank's *Economic Survey*, and for lack of this he was no doubt well advised not to attempt a systematic analysis of economic conditions. Again, he pays much attention to religious history and is very alive to religion's more intimate appeal; yet he treats of it mainly as a matter for management by Erastian monarchs, whether pagan or Christian, in support of the secular arm.

Kornemann's main interest lies in imperial politics, and to him political history is essentially the record of its empire-making and empire-sustaining great men. There is nothing better in his book than his portraits of celebrities. True, he overrates Caesar as a connoisseur of men, but he has some excellent pieces in his gallery of Roman emperors: Augustus, whose consummate prudence did not damp his self-confidence or relax his strong nerve; Tiberius, the sincere but tongue-tied *homme incompris*; Constantine, like Augustus, an essentially conservative reformer and an authentic Roman; Theodora's deft domination over the fuss-pot Justinian.

The preoccupation of the author with big personalities may sufficiently explain why he by-passes early Greece and Italy, but hardly accounts for his

total
sind
supern
of
as he
the H
emper
Roma
on his
Zwang
The
supern
peace.
'robbe
Ides o
state.
togeth
bureau
raises
of trav
proper
perman
gives
where
Hadria
gestion
cohere
pendon
modern
than th
Reac
but all
the las
As K
the rea
which
Kornem
Germa

ALFRE
Thessa
Main:
It is a
compil
by such
the ma

total neglect of the Periclean age. Are we to say, with Schiller, 'Ja, die Zeiten sind groß, aber die Männer sind klein'? In any case, his special interest in supermen is not due to a naïve fascination by the *kolossal*, still less to a streak of *Stöpsel*. Kornemann is outspoken in condemning sultanic irresponsibility, such as he detects in Alexander; his sympathies go plainly to the *Volksmonarchen* of the Henri Quatre type—to Philip and Augustus—and to the never-say-die emperors of the Illyrian line, who repeated the *labor improbus* of the antique Romans; he trounces the pervasive sneakiness in high Byzantine circles; he is on his guard against benevolent despots, the unheeding architects of the *Zwangstaat*.

The ultimate reason for Kornemann's particular regard for super-states and supermen may be found in his quest for stable political unions and world-peace. The emergence of a world-state, however ephemeral, out of Alexander's 'robber-razzia' realized a supreme political ideal, and the real tragedy of the Ides of March lay in this, that Caesar could not re-unite Alexander's world-state. Kornemann indeed admits that a world-autocracy could not be held together without a world-bureaucracy, and that good autocrats and good bureaucrats alike are political windfalls. But the crux of the problem which he raises relates rather to the optimum size of ancient states, given ancient methods of travel and communication. He has some inkling of this, for he rates at its proper high worth the long arm of the Byzantine navy and emphasizes the permanent destructiveness of the Vandal and Islamic thalassocracies. He also gives credit to Augustus for stabilizing Rome's eastern boundaries. Yet elsewhere he castigates Augustus for setting his aims lower than Caesar, and Hadrian for fixing the Roman frontiers all round; and he turns down the suggestions that a purely or mainly European empire would have gained in coherence and stability what it lost in latitude and longitude. In spite of stupendous improvements in methods of travel and communication, the verdict of modern history still runs in favour of the elastic bond of world federation rather than the iron clamp of world-conquest. Yet *adhuc sub iudice lis est*.

Readers of Kornemann's book will need to study it in a questioning spirit; but all who appreciate courageous thinking and spirited writing will enjoy the last work of this stout and fresh veteran.

As Kornemann's executor Dr. Bengtson has done good service in drawing the reader's attention in footnotes to recent important non-German works to which the author did not have access. The number of recent books which Kornemann quotes at the foot of his pages also attests the activity of German scholars during the war and after.

M. CARY

THE GEOGRAPHY OF GREECE

ALFRED PHILIPPSON: *Die griechischen Landschaften*. Band I, Teil 1: Thessalien und die Spercheios-Senke. Pp. 308: 4 maps. Frankfurt-am-Main: Klostermann, 1950. Paper, DM. 20.

It is almost fifty years since Alfred Philippson announced his intention of compiling a systematic account of the Geography of Greece. Now, undaunted by such setbacks as world wars and concentration camps and undeterred by the march of advancing years, he has published the first part of the first of four

volumes with a clarity of style and a courage of purpose which command the highest respect. For the execution of the whole work he has recruited the assistance of H. Lehmann and E. Kirsten, of whom the latter has contributed a chapter on the historical geography of Thessaly in the present volume. All classical scholars will wish Dr. Philippson many years of health and strength to carry his work further and will extend their good wishes to his collaborators in this major task.

This volume describes Thessaly and the basin of the Spercheus valley. The main basis of the study lies in the personal researches of Dr. Philippson; these were undertaken in the last century, when his important work on Thessaly and Epirus was published (1897), and his familiarity with the country-side was refreshed in 1928 and 1934 when he travelled again in Greek lands. The literary sources which he uses are the works of travellers, among whom W. M. Leake is outstanding, and of specialists who are concerned with geology, population, climate, forestry, and so forth. A full bibliography of such works on Thessaly is included in the volume, and it is gratifying to note that modern Greek writers have received full attention. The only addition which may be worth suggesting is the *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, which contains first-class articles on districts and places in the Greek world. The four maps at the end of the volume portray the surroundings of Volos, a part of east Thessaly, north-eastern Greece (with some indication of geological boundaries), and the settlements both ancient and medieval in this area. The maps are clear and not overburdened with names, and the fourth map, compiled by Dr. Kirsten, is most interesting. The authors have taken the wise step of providing outline maps and of leaving the reader to consult more detailed maps elsewhere. It is a pity that a list of such maps is not included in the volume. In recording ancient and modern place-names Dr. Philippson has adopted a clear system, and he has wisely given two modern Greek names where two are, as so often, current in modern times. There is no general index to the volume; but the layout by districts will enable the reader to find any name without undue difficulty. The absence of an index and of detailed and coloured maps has made possible the production of a well-printed volume at a reasonable price.

Dr. Philippson deals primarily with modern geographical conditions. He adopts as the northern border of Greek lands the watershed between the rivers Haliacmon and Peneus, and he includes the Aous and its tributaries as far north as Tepeléni in the area of Greek Epirus. With this definition few except modern Greek nationalists will quarrel, since the plains of central Albania and the plateaux of upper Macedonia are more closely related in climate and in structure to the Balkan mainland than to the Greek peninsula. His first chapter describes the general characteristics of Thessaly often in a vivid manner, so that one recalls many familiar sights; the lumbering buffalo-carts, the chattering storks so appropriately called 'lelekya', the asphodels ghostly by moonlight, the deep summer-dust of the tracks, the bleak steppe-like expanse in winter, and the outlook from the hills after dawn when the plain is as measureless as the sea. Among the entrances to Thessaly more emphasis might be given to the breach south-east of Grevená in the mountain ring—a breach which the Germans exploited in 1941—and to the coastal route via Halus which was commonly used in ancient times. He accepts Wace's hypothesis, that the western plain was forested in prehistoric times, with some reserve because the bleak winds of winter and the summer drought are inimical to all save the hardiest

and
to th
mon
1943
his v
some
and
state
detai
aspec
whic
The
than
Gree
conce
habit
chapt
that
'Pene
conqu
ledge
identi
are ca
is inc
Thess
is mo
too an
is stin
furthe
most

Clare C

Suppl
bus C
HONN

THE
the P
of I.G.
Corin
scatter
the p
Final
here c
The
date t
comm

and deep-rooting trees. As Dr. Philippson intends to devote a separate section to the Pindus range, he starts his detailed study with the famous rocks and monasteries of Kalabáka, a once picturesque town burnt to the ground in 1943, and with the oak-scrub country of Chássia which has altered little since his visit in 1893 save that more arable land has been formed by burning down some of the woods. In early summer the Chássia is a paradise of nightingales, and the area is of great interest to geologists. But it is enough in this review to state that each canton of Thessaly and of the Spercheus valley receives a detailed and vivid description. An excellent chapter summarizes the important aspects of Thessaly in regard to geological formation and to human geography, which is treated from prehistoric to modern times.

The chapter on historical geography by Dr. Kirsten relies more on maps than on autopsy; thus he rejects Wace's hypothesis on the evidence of the Greek staff map which shows tumuli in west Thessaly, but the surveyor is not concerned with the question whether a tumulus is the result of prehistoric habitation. It is a pity that ancient authors are cited without reference to chapter and verse. One would like to check the authorities for the statement that the tribes expelled into the hills by the Thessali had their own serfs or 'Penestae'. Interesting parallels are drawn between the institutions of the conquering Thessali and of the conquering Turks, although our scanty knowledge of the former is perhaps pressed too far. The study of topography, the identification of ancient sites, and the account of Thessaly's ancient history are carefully executed, and a cursory narrative of medieval and modern times is included. Finally, the nature and the distribution of population-centres in Thessaly throughout the ages are expounded and discussed. Dr. Kirsten's aim is more ambitious and more difficult than that of Dr. Philippson. The results too are different; for Dr. Philippson's work is definitive whereas Dr. Kirsten's is stimulating and interesting but inspires less confidence in its conclusions. A further bibliography is attached to Dr. Kirsten's chapter. Altogether this is a most interesting and valuable book.

Clare College, Cambridge

N. G. L. HAMMOND

PELOPONNESIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Volumen XI, fasciculus i. Adiuvantibus G. Daux, G. Klaffenbach, M. N. Tod, redigendum curavit J. J. HONDIUS. Pp. 80. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1950. Paper.

THE new fascicule of *S.E.G.* contains the first instalment of the inscriptions of the Peloponnese published, or in some cases republished, since the appearance of *I.G.* iv in 1903. The new inscriptions are derived mainly from Meritt's *Corinth*, viii. 1, Bees's *Die griechisch-christliche Inschriften von Hellas*, i, the various scattered publications of the Argive texts (the majority by W. Vollgraff), and the publication, mainly in Greek periodicals, of the Sicyonian inscriptions. Finally there are the numerous inscriptions from Laconia, of which we have here only a first instalment.

There is as usual little to criticize in the volume. The editors present an up-to-date text of the inscriptions, with bibliography and a minimum of exegetical comment. A few points are, however, worth noticing. Nos. 8-10, 13: painted

epitaphs from Aegina, each of which bears the name of an eponym ($\epsilon\pi\iota$ + genit.), followed by a date expressed by a Macedonian month. On these *S.E.G.* comments: 'Titulos positos esse quo tempore Pergameni insulam possidebant produnt nomina mensium.' But the name of one of the eponyms is $\Gamma\upsilon\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (No. 10: $\epsilon\pi\iota \Gamma\upsilon\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$), and it is at least unlikely that the eponym of Aegina in the Attalid period bore a Roman praenomen. (This difficulty, ignored in the first publication of the stones, was perhaps finally felt by Welter in *Aigina*, 1938, where he states, p. 45: 'Ähnlich wie in Pergamon bildete sich auch in Aigina eine Rom freundliche Partei, wie im gräzisierten römischen Namen zu erkennen ist'; but the suggestion is not very satisfactory.) As is clear from the photograph of the stones in Karo, *A.A.* xlv, 1931, p. 279, the writing is almost cursive, and gives itself no clue to date, though the depinti are all on a single block and are clearly contemporary. The most obvious explanation is that the tombs are of Roman date, and that the Macedonian calendar survived in Aegina after the Roman acquisition of the island. In this there is nothing surprising. The use of the Macedonian calendar in the Roman province of Asia, to which Aegina, as previously Pergamene territory, probably belonged (Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia*, 1946, pp. 237-8. Magie, *Romans in Asia*, I, p. 155 (cf. II, p. 1044, note 29), attributes Aegina to Achaea-Macedonia, but without cogent reasons) was formally established in 9 B.C., by the decree concerning the Provincial *fasti*, *O.G.I.S.* 458 = Ehrenberg-Jones, *Augustan Documents*, 98 (in which the fragment from Maconia Lydiae, comprising lines 8-20, published by Keil-Premmerstein, *2te. Reise*, 1911, p. 80, No. 166, is not noted), and survived for long years afterwards.

The further conclusion which *S.E.G.* borrows from Karo, that the Thracians Kotys (No. 11) and Aulouporis (No. 12) were 'fortasse post expeditionem ab Attalo II paullo post a. 144 in Thraciam factam Aeginam obsides ducti', can therefore hardly stand. It may be noted that another Thracian appears in Aegina well in the Roman period: *I.G.* iv. 112: $\Delta\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omicron\pi\omicron\rho\iota\varsigma \Pi\alpha\tau\tilde{\alpha} \chi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon$.

No. 18. To the bibliography on the names of ancient ships add: Hiller von Gaertringen, *Laographia*, vii, 1923, pp. 58-60, No. 6 (cf. *S.E.G.* i. 345); Blinkenberg, *Inscr. Lindos*, Index, p. 1191, s.v. $\text{Εὐανδρία, Εὐανδρία Δ, Εὐανδρία Σεβαστρία}$.

No. 50. 'Dedicatio Iovi Dionysio, aet. imp.' Comprehension of this most puzzling inscription is not greatly helped by its re-edition here. The title, the addition of iota subscript to $\Delta\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\omega$, and the expansion of $\delta\epsilon$ into $\delta\epsilon(\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu)$ presumably indicate that the editors accept Miss Guarducci's most hazardous interpretation of the inscription; 'A me sembra che non sia necessario—questa volte—incolpare il lapicida. Zeus non deve essere separato da Dionysos, ma deve formare insieme con esso la figura già conosciuto [once only!] di Zeus Dionysos.' But if there is no lapicide's error, and $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \Delta\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\omega$ refers to a single deity, what is the explanation of the difference of case? If it is meant to be 'Dionysos, the son of Zeus' then we should be told; this, at least, could not make a cult of Zeus Dionysos. There can be no doubt that $\Delta\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\omega$ is a dative, since the photograph published by Mitsos, *Αρχ. Έφ.*, 1936, p. 146, shows a final kappa after the $\delta\epsilon$, giving $\delta\epsilon\kappa(\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu)$; it is thus clear that the inscription records in the first place a dedication to Dionysos. What $\Delta\text{ΙΟC}$ is must remain uncertain. If the reading be retained it is difficult to avoid the assumption of a lapicide's error. Perhaps $\delta\acute{\iota}\{\omicron\}$ s, influenced by the succeeding $\Delta\iota\omicron\nu$ --- is more probable than Mitsos' $\Delta\iota\{\iota\}$ $\Delta\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\omega \langle\tau\rangle\epsilon$, the $\langle\tau\rangle\epsilon$ here being anyhow impossible because of the final $\delta\epsilon\kappa(\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu)$.

No.
Ancien
Nos
Christ
No.
due to
here u
between
though
sinistro
larity.
ivy-lea
that er
TOIA,
Nos.
Xenop
for the
certain
hardly
No.
Nos.
rather
respon
from 3
have b
in doul
of 377-
then 3
Μεγερ
entire
(λωος
Epidau
22-3:
This in
New
ance of
servant
Brasen
J. M. I
10 pla
25s. ne
The tw
kind of
istic era
fidence

No. 71. Add the important discussion concerning Eurycles by Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta*, pp. 169-204.

Nos. 168 ff. Attention may be drawn to the interesting 'Berufsname' in these Christian inscriptions.

No. 250. *δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας* τὸ γ[ι']?, *ὑπαρχον* τὸ - - -. This restoration is due to S.E.G., Orlandos, the original editor, having left the second line given here unrestored. Orlandos's majuscule copy indicates a space for three letters between γ and α. The restoration γ[ι']? does not seem very satisfactory, since, though there are instances of imperial years being inscribed so as to be read *sinistrorsus* (e.g. S.B. 5959 = S.B. 8787), it is unwise to restore such an irregularity. The obvious remedy is to assume a blank space, or the inscription of an ivy-leaf, between the *trib. pot.* and the consulate. It may be noted incidentally that errors in this precise item are not unknown: *Syll.*³ 837 has TIA twice for T0IA, and *ibid.* 839 has TOΓ for TOIG.

Nos. 131 and 251. Both these bases are signed by the Argive sculptors Xenophilos and Straton. For the first inscription the date is given as 's. iii. a.', for the second as 's. ii a.'. The date of Xenophilos and Straton is indeed uncertain (v. Pomtow, *Klio*, xv, 1918, pp. 54-5), but this, if it be not an error, is hardly the way to express uncertainty.

No. 309. In the rubric read 's. iv a.' for 's. iv p.'.

Nos. 377 and 405. The correspondences between these two texts have gone rather astray. (a) In 377. 1 the first σ of *συνέλυσαν* is underlined though the corresponding passage, 405. 1, has δ[ιέλυσαν], while *συνέλυσαν* is supplied *ibid.* line 23 from 377. 24. δ[ιέλυσαν] may, as Wilhelm thought, *Wien. Anz.* 1948, pp. 64-6, have been inscribed in error for σ[υνέλυσαν], but the reading of the stone is not in doubt. The oversight, like others in these two texts, occurs in Peek's *Urtext* of 377. (b) 377. 8 has *Μενεκράτους*, but 405. 7 has *Με[νεκράτους]*. At the most then 377 should read *Μενεκράτους*. The reading of 405. 7, as given here, *Μενεκράτους*, is, however, itself a mystery. *I.G.*² iv. 75 gives a lacuna for this entire line, which, on the basis of 377, Wilhelm, *op. cit.* pp. 65-6, filled as [*λυνος τοῦ Καλλιστράτου {στ[ράτου]}*]. Peek, who reread the fragment in Epidaurus, does not record a new reading here (v. *op. cit.*, p. 49 note 1). (c) 377. 22-3: *αἰγῶν πρὸς*: 405. 22: *αἰγῶν πρὸς*. 377 should therefore be *αἰγῶν πρὸς*. This inaccuracy also derives from Peek.

News of the sudden death of Dr. Hondius shortly followed the appearance of this fascicule. Epigraphy has lost one of its most devoted and tireless servants, and all scholars in his field will mourn his passing.

Brasenose College, Oxford

PETER FRASER

AINOS

J. M. F. MAY: *Ainos, its History and Coinage, 474-341 B.C.* Pp. xviii + 288; 10 plates, 2 maps. London: Oxford University Press, 1950. Cloth, 25s. net.

THE two dates which form a part of the title of this book are in themselves a kind of challenge, since there are very few Greek coinages before the Hellenistic era for which such precise datings could be claimed with so much confidence. Yet Mr. May has handled his material with competence, and has

carried through the establishment of die-links and sequences with such skill as to demonstrate once more how great are the contributions to historical knowledge which a numismatist can make. Earlier studies on the coinage of Ainos made by von Fritze in *Nomisma*, iv (1909) and by Strack in *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands*, 2. i (1912) are now superseded as far as the fifth- and fourth-century silver coinage of the city is concerned. In the process of gathering his material from museums, collectors, and art-dealers, Mr. May has been less handicapped than might have been feared by the inaccessibility, by reason of political circumstances, of certain famous collections; and he has been able to record the surprisingly large number of 775 surviving silver coins of this one state issued within 133 years. This is a very high proportion, and is evidence for the remarkable prosperity of Ainos during two centuries.

Four main coinage periods are distinguished; and in the first of these (c. 474/3-449/8 B.C.) the city attained a sudden and marked commercial importance, though essentially under the aegis of Athenian maritime power. In addition to this politico-commercial influence one ought probably to recognize the influence of Athens upon the shape and the very high artistic quality of this money. Ainos began of a sudden about 474 B.C. to strike her impressive tetradrachms which, by the second year of issue, bore upon the obverse the head of the state's chief deity, and upon the reverse that deity's sacred animal. Here is in every respect an exact adaptation to Ainos of the fabric and design of the money of Athens, the more remarkable since in the early fifth century no other Greek state was striking tetradrachms upon that model. However, by the third year of issue Ainos added the symbol of an annual magistrate, which was then an Asiatic Greek monetary custom. Yet it seems likely that on more than one occasion engravers must have been imported—from Athens possibly—to make coin dies.

Mr. May's classification, amply supported in most cases by die-sequences, seems convincing, though in one instance only I would like to suggest the possibility of a small shift, for his Group XV, Nos. 67-74, having the cult-image of Hermes on a throne for its symbol, may be earlier than he thinks. There is a possibility that it should be inserted before his Group VII and therefore dated to about 464 B.C. Obviously the first engraver of tetradrachm dies was imported about 474 B.C.; then, perhaps in 464 B.C., there arrived the brilliant artist who made Nos. 67 to 74, and I think he might have influenced the man, or men, who made the Hermes heads of No. 26 and some following dies. Moreover, the goat of No. 26 looks like a poorish copy of the fine goats on Nos. 67 to 74. A third brilliant engraver appears to have been imported about 453 B.C. to make the dies for Nos. 85 to 91.

The second coinage period lies between about 435 and 404 B.C. and contains relatively few tetradrachms but great numbers of diobols, and this has been convincingly explained as caused by the need of small change for soldiers' pay, the rise in power at this time of the Odrysian kingdom in Thrace being responsible for military activity.

In the third period, c. 404 to 356 B.C., the monetary process is reversed, small change being quite rare and tetradrachms—the long series with the facing head of Hermes—common, a new coin-standard, the Chian, being adopted. The influence of the Odrysian kingdom was not so great during most of this period because of rivalry between various Thracian princes. The fourth and final period of silver coinage covers the remaining years down to 341 B.C. when

Ainos passed into the hands of Philip of Macedon. Only drachmae were struck and these bore a new reverse type; Hermes Perpheraios upon his throne.

One of the most interesting sections is chapter x on 'Types', beginning with an account of the magical history (from a papyrus discovered at Tebtunis in 1934) of the Hermes of Ainos, known as Hermes Perpheraios and reputed to have been carved by Epeios, maker of the Wooden Horse. It is a picture of this image which appears before the goat on the tetradrachms 67 to 74. The image stands upon the seat of a high-backed arm-chair, and seems to be an unwrought stump of a pine-tree on top of which is a bearded head wearing a conical cap—a pilos, not a petasos as worn by the god on the obverses of all coins of Ainos. The details can only be properly observed in an enlargement (e.g. my *Masterpieces of Greek Coinage*, p. 53), and a pilos appearing as part of the magistrates' symbol on certain tetradrachms of Ainos, Nos. 269 to 277, resembles this same cap. The head of the god on all the silver coinage must represent the head of another and quite different image, possibly the same statue which figures as a symbol on tetradrachms Nos. 249, 250.

Appendix B is about the unique small gold coin of Ainos, in the British Museum, which Mr. May thinks may bear a portrait of Ptolemy II or III as Hermes. But, until more examples of the piece are found, this remains a guess, and a dubious one.

The plates are well arranged, though disappointing in quality, especially when compared with the superb plates in *Nomisma* iv, referred to above. The printing, planning, and arrangement are admirable; and fortunately there is an exceedingly good index. One hopes that the book may serve as a model to other authors working on other Greek mints.

Queens' College, Cambridge

CHARLES SELTMAN

COINS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

HAROLD MATTINGLY: *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*. Volume V: Pertinax to Elagabalus. Pp. cclxvi+699; 97 plates (separately bound). London: British Museum, 1950. Cloth, £8. 8s. net.

THESE Catalogues, as we already know well, contain unparalleled collections of material (though its delimitation [vol. i, p. v] is unsatisfactory), abundant and increasingly excellent plates, and the highly controversial and indispensable introductions of Harold Mattingly. Of the present volume it may be said at once that, if an historian were cast on a desert island and ordered to write a history of the Severan Age using one book only (ancient or modern), this is the book that he might well choose. It contains massive evidence, enormously outstripping Cohen; and Mattingly's opinions on the epoch will need to be given the most careful consideration.

Unfortunately, the scheme of the volume makes this difficult. This is not so much due to the large amount of repetition, which indeed—like the long historical notes, pp. clxxvii n. 3, clxxix n. 1, clx n. 2, clxxxviii f. n. 4—some readers may prefer to a more succinct arrangement of cross-referencing. More exacting is the repeated 'nibbling' at topics, a little here, a little there, repetitive, supplementary, and sometimes contradictory—e.g. the *Tres Monetae* (pp. xxiv, xxvii, xcvi, clxix, clxxxviii, clxxxiv f., cclxvi), and *Salus* (pp. clxiv,

clxvii, clxxvii—all omitted from Index VI, good though the Indexes are; but ought not Liegle, *Hermes*, 1942, pp. 249 ff. to be mentioned in connexion with *Salus*?). Another such instance of rehandling is the question (hardly soluble, as yet) of the relation at this period, if any, between *senatus consulta* and the coinage. Index VI shows many references to the Senate. Quite a number of these passages embroider a doubtful theory that the bad relations between that body and Severus affected the *aes* coinage. And it is hard to reconcile completely pp. xxiii, clxiv n. 1, clxxxii n. 4, ccix f.; a single, brief treatment (however inconclusive) would have been welcome.

This question is important to Mattingly's persistence in a general distinction between gold and silver (grouped together) on the one hand, and *aes* on the other. Dr. K. Pink has objected strongly to this arrangement, and Mattingly's discussions of types for any given year would be even more effective if the *aes* were not always discussed, rather lamely, quite apart from the gold and silver (which are discussed together). This overriding duality—disquietingly reminiscent of the admittedly unacceptable Mommsenian dyarchy (not 'dynasty', p. xxiii)—is not necessarily justified by the survival on the *aes* of S. C., probably now vestigial and almost formal (incidentally, it occurs on some pieces which can only be described as medallions); and Mattingly's emphasis on the individuality of *aes* types is weakened by necessary reservations (pp. xxiii, lxv, cviii, ccxxiv). Besides, the differences in type between *aes* on the one hand and gold and silver on the other are no greater than those between gold on the one hand and silver on the other; in Severus' first *decennium* alone there are nearly 50 *aurei* of which no corresponding *denarii* are recorded. Nor is any *grouping together* of gold and silver, in contradistinction to *aes*, warranted by the epigraphic evidence. It is to be hoped that, in future volumes, all the metals and denominations issued by a mint during any one year or period will be discussed together.

Within this dual distinction by metals there is a classification by mints (necessarily somewhat conjectural; serious refutation of opposing views is not always attempted, though perhaps this is not the place for it; but the mints of Macrinus and Elagabalus, in particular, are dealt with in too cursory fashion). This procedure of marshalling coins by metals and (secondarily) by mints is adopted over and over again in a succession of 'periods'. The latter are sometimes reigns, but the reigns of Severus and Caracalla are treated as five 'periods' (see p. vii). This is not very satisfactory, since border-lines, e.g. the promotion of Geta to Augustus (p. clxxvi n. 1; cf. p. cxc), are artificial; discussions stray into wrong compartments or overlap (pp. clviii, clix, 272 f., Pl. 61. 1-2), and overlaps require much explanation (at least 11 times for Julia Domna alone).

The Introduction often does not marry with the text, e.g. on many aspects of the eastern mintages. Nor is it entirely true that 'the Introduction strictly follows the order of the text' (p. 629 n. 1): witness pp. 156, 213 n., 468 n., etc. But these inconsistencies are probably in part due to the extremely difficult conditions under which the book was written, and the scarcely less formidable difficulties which accompanied its preparation for the press. The latter task was achieved despite the absence of the author in the Antipodes, and great credit is due to Dr. J. Allan and Mr. R. A. G. Carson for its successful accomplishment.

The Introduction of this volume is, like its predecessors, full of illuminating

generalizations, many of them opening up new vistas of study. 'Subordinate officials . . . could never have produced the significant changes that we meet' (p. lxiii n. 2). 'Even when a year shows several dated types, it is possible that only one of them was struck in mass' (p. clvii n. 1). 'The impersonality of Vesta can easily be overstressed' (p. cxxxv n. 4). The type of two Victories 'raises the . . . question whether a Virtue, applied to more than one person, is to be thought of as one or more than one' (p. clxxxii n. 5). 'It is remarkable that the central cult of old Rome (that of the Capitoline Triad) receives so little advertisement' (p. xxxix).

We are again reminded that no one has done more than Mattingly to abolish the ridiculous old-fashioned dichotomy between numismatics and history. This merit is apparent on every page. But the historical significance of the coinage is probably not always so *topical* as he suggests. School-boy princes did not 'control' an *officina* (p. xxiv), and a young princess was not its 'mistress' (p. cliv). Nor would Didius Iulianus have wished to sketch on the coinage 'his own conception of Empire as a glittering prize for the ambitious' (p. xxxviii). Nor should we say that 'the Roman citizens . . . were the constituents of Rome, the central constituency of the Empire' (p. xlvii); or that Geta's "signature tune", to use a very modern idiom, is "Provid(entia) Deorum"—the type was often used by Caracalla, and later by Elagabalus.

Here perhaps there is too much stress on contemporary vividness. On the other hand Mattingly, though no one is more justly appreciative of the role of religion at Rome (pp. xlvi, clxxx n. 2, cciv n. 3), seems to have underestimated the traditional references of the coinage—notably to the anniversaries of Republican temple-foundations and of early imperial landmarks, both stressed, in the present reviewer's opinion, by Pertinax, perhaps also by Didius Iulianus, and particularly by Severus.

However, these are only a few detailed comments on a book which truly breaks important new ground in the still largely untilled field of historical numismatics. The British Museum and Mattingly have given a splendid example of pertinacity in pushing forward this majestic series, in less than thirty years, to a fifth volume, completing the first quarter-millennium of the Roman Principate. It should give Dr. J. Allan much satisfaction to recall that the bulk of this great work was completed while he was Keeper of Coins and Medals.

University of Edinburgh

MICHAEL GRANT

COMMEMORATIVE ROMAN COIN TYPES

MICHAEL GRANT: *Roman Anniversary Issues*. An exploratory study of the numismatic and medallic commemoration of anniversary years, 49 B.C.—A.D. 375. Pp. xxiv + 204; 2 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 21s. net.

In what his sub-title modestly calls 'an exploratory study' Professor Grant has made a substantial contribution to the technique of interpreting the ever-varying types which the Romans placed upon their coins. The legends which accompany these types often explain fully their purpose and occasion (e.g. CONGIAR PRIMVM P R DAT of Titus, AEGYPTO CAPTA of Augustus), but

very often, though the legend identifies the type, we have had no means of determining, except by vague and unverifiable deductions from the general situation at the time of issue, why one type should be chosen rather than another. Grant demonstrates that many such types are connected with anniversaries (mostly centenaries together with their subdivisions and multiples), and are often repeated on the coinage at appropriate intervals. The occasions so commemorated are very various; many are religious, and recall the foundations and dedications of temples; others are political, among which the traditional date for the expulsion of the kings (510 B.C.) and the *respublica restituta* of 27 B.C. are prominent; yet others are events in the lives of famous men, such as the birth or consecration of Augustus, and others again seem to commemorate events in the history of the coinage itself. In this last category the most striking example is the allusion, contained in the 'three standards' type of Nero and Clodius Macer (and Vindex?), to the legionary coinage of Antony on the centenary of its issue, and the explicit 'restoration' of this same coinage by M. Aurelius and Verus exactly a century later. Coin finds from Pompeii prove that large numbers of Antony's coins were still in circulation at least as late as A.D. 79, and this makes it probable that the anniversary recalled is numismatic rather than personal.

Such is the theme that Grant traces from the Republic to the late fourth century with his customary wealth of learning and documentation. An admirable introductory chapter is designed to dispel the doubts of those who find the theme improbable on *a priori* grounds, and a final chapter conveniently summarizes the most popular anniversaries at different periods. Altogether the claim of the anniversary theme to consideration in the interpretation of coin types is firmly established.

However, as he himself anticipates, while further research may add to his examples, some that he quotes may be rejected. Particularly controversial is his chapter on Tiberius resting on its theory of 'deferred tribunician dating'. A number of Tiberius' types bear the date **TR POT XXIIII** (A.D. 22/3); one of these records the grant of a *carpentum* to Livia, known in other cases to be a posthumous honour, which should therefore follow her death in A.D. 29. On the basis of this apparent instance of a coin dated 22/3 being issued in 29, a number of other Tiberian types are attributed to fresh dates on historical or iconographical grounds. Judgement on these latter must await Grant's promised defence of these criteria; the historical arguments, however, can to some extent be tested by numismatic evidence. Thus, for the three *sestertius* types **DIVVS AVGVSTVS PATER**, **SPQR IVLIAE AVGVST** and **CIVITATIBVS ASIAE RESTITVTIS** (all dated **TR POT XXIIII**) he proposes respectively A.D. 23, 29, and 30/1. Yet on specimens in the British Museum these three types share a common reverse die (*B.M.C. Emp.* I Tib. Nos. 70, 75, 77), which suggests—though it cannot alone prove—contemporary striking. A similar test could be applied to the **IVSTITIA** and **SALVS AVGVSTA dupondii** for which the dates 23 and 31 are proposed. As Grant recognizes in an addendum (p. 183), if the *carpentum* is not posthumous, the need for delayed dating largely disappears. Is it not possible that Livia, as *sacerdos divi Augusti*, was granted the honour of a *carpentum sacrorum publicorum causa*, under which circumstances alone women were allowed to ride in it (Livy xxxiv. 1)?

The interpretation given to certain Asian tetradrachms (pp. 76–7) illustrates another hazard in the anniversary field. One type shows a temple,

labelled ROM ET AVG, within which Victory crowns an emperor. After an undated first appearance under Claudius (*R.I.C.* I Claudius 52), a unique specimen of Vespasian is dated A.D. 70 (*B.M.C. Emp.* II Vesp. 449), which can be explained as the centenary of Actium or of the capture of Egypt, although in neither case is the reference of the type explicit. An undated issue of Domitian is no help (*R.I.C.* II Dom. 224), after which the type was issued in 97 and 98 for Nerva (*ibid.*, Nerva 122 and 123), and in 98-9 for Trajan (*ibid.*, Trajan 723). Where, as here, both the type and the series are specialized, we are justified in looking for similar circumstances behind similar types, but the anniversary explanation, while appropriate to 70, is not so to the years 97 to 99. Perhaps these issues have rather something to do with the induction at the beginning of each reign of a new Augustus into the cult of *Roma et Augustus*. While the centenary which fell in 70 was certainly noticed, it does seem that it did not occasion the issue of tetradrachms.

Particularly interesting is the passage on certain types of the British emperor Carausius (pp. 143 ff.), although it may be suggested that his ROM ET AV (Rome standing by altar) type has less to do with the, to us, more familiar altar of Lugdunum, which was no obvious concern of Carausius, than with the establishment of the imperial cult in Britain by Claudius, whose peculiar type *Constantiae Augusti* he also repeats on the 250th anniversary of its original issue.

Lastly it should be explained that the two plates are devoted to the welcome publication of certain rare and conjectural pieces of the Julio-Claudian period that are not otherwise easily accessible. The value of this is unfortunately lessened by illustrating only one side of some of the coins. The importance of illustrating both sides is well demonstrated from the plates themselves, where Pls. I. 10 and II. 1 both share the same obverse die, which is good evidence that both these unusual coins were minted in the same place and issued by the same authority. The rare and unorthodox can often be correctly attributed only through its combination with a common and therefore more easily attributable die.

This book gives us a valuable new instrument for the interpretation of coin types, but it is an instrument to be used with great care and discrimination. There are many irrelevant coincidences in history, and the guiding principle in each case must be, Did an anniversary play a major part in occasioning an issue, or was it an irrelevant coincidence?

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

C. M. KRAAY

COLONIAL AND MUNICIPAL COINAGE UNDER TIBERIUS

MICHAEL GRANT: *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius*. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 116.) Pp. xviii+205; 8 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1950. Paper, \$5.

FROM the vast range of the non-central *aes* coinages of Augustus, illuminated and described in his *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, Professor Grant has quickly marched, with brief pauses to look keenly ahead, to the *aes* coinages struck under Tiberius by the Roman *coloniae* and *municipia*, mainly in the provinces (Spain excepted).

In this work, as before, he has performed services of exceptional value. The issues which he now examines have hitherto been unfashionable: they are scarce: they are often rough in execution, and in bad preservation; and, when they have been examined previously, it has usually been in relation to the other (non-colonial or non-municipal) coinages of the areas in which these Roman towns were situated. This, plainly, was wrong practice. Although it would be surprising to find no relationship at all between the coins of a *colonia* or *municipium* and its neighbouring *oppida peregrina*, the true relationship (as this book implies) lies rather between the *colonia* or *municipium* and Rome itself; for we are dealing, after all, with foundations of *cives Romani*.

How close was the coinage-link between Rome and its government, on the one hand, and mainly provincial *coloniae* and *municipia* on the other, is a question which Grant does not discuss on its own merits. It is implied throughout that there was little, if any, room for *laissez faire*. We know, of course, that the right of coinage was something which could only be gained by imperial bestowal, as is plain, for example, from the frequently appearing *permissus* of the Spanish *aes* and from the *moneta impetrata* of (?) Patrae. But, once that right had been sought and gained, to what extent was a *colonia* or *municipium* bound to make use of this or that coin-type, this or that formula, on its resultant issues? The question is pertinent in regard to the present book, since it is involved in much of Grant's argument on other matters.

To judge from the coins now presented to us, Tiberius clearly made no alteration in the Augustan system of metal or metrology so far as these *coloniae* and *municipia* were concerned. Nor did he vary the Augustan pattern of the occasions on which the right of coinage was normally granted: these Roman cities continued, as under Augustus, to strike coinages in connexion with local anniversaries or with major imperial anniversaries whose significance was empire-wide. There was no restriction by Tiberius in the number of Roman cities possessing rights of coinage—rather the reverse if, with Grant, we accept as an essential (though clearly unequal) basis for comparison with the 23 years of Tiberius' rule the 16 years of Augustus' rule from 2 B.C. (i.e. when he became P.P.) until A.D. 14. Nor was there any tendency to close down mints in the light of troublesome nationalist tendencies, as had previously been supposed. Here, then, on Grant's very able showing, no changes in the Augustan system can be discerned; and it is difficult to find evidence of imperial interference in the internal affairs of colonial coinages once the right of coinage had been gained.

Even when there are signs of pressure by the central government, such pressure seems not to have been aimed explicitly at the control of colonial and municipal coin-types. For example, the absence from these Tiberian coins of the names of *praefecti* representing the *princeps* or members of his house in local magistracies, though it is rightly interpreted as showing restriction upon the initiative of Roman cities, shows a restriction which was truly valid for administrative affairs alone, being merely reflected in the coinage. And the brilliant exposition of the part played by those who were the *amici* (and connexions) of Tiberius in the administration of proconsular Africa, though it suggests a more direct application of imperial pressure in the control of the day-to-day features of the coinage, does not in fact indicate that such pressure was either uniform or constant.

It is probably not untrue to say that, once the right of coinage had been secured, a Roman city, after acquiring supplies of suitable metal (and *orichalcum*

seem
a con
which
emph
view
to Au
It wi
comm
imme
Gram
will r
genetr
cipal
to tim
time-
of em

If
nexio
of co
be we
and l
auspi
convic
the c
perpet
Augus
respec
partia
cian
consul
very s
in Ti
a fro

Astmo

Mem
plate
Press

L. R.
name
the f
factur
reason
order
years

seems to have been denied to them) and making blanks of a weight lying within a comfortable range of possibilities, might usually impress these with designs which, though certainly owing something to the *aes* coins of Rome in matters of emphasis and idiom, were nevertheless not formally dictated to them. Such a view will explain, for example, the 'milder' character of Tiberian, as opposed to Augustan, nomenclature, as well as the occasional irregularities of titulature. It will explain also the comparative ubiquity of the 'seated Livia' type, which, common on Roman *aes*, was seized upon widely as a vehicle to express the immense veneration in which Livia was held in the rôles (admirably argued by Grant) of *sacerdos divi Augusti* and heiress to the Roman Vestal tradition, and will relieve us of any temptation to term 'extravagant' such Livian epithets as *genetrix orbis*. And finally it will explain the impact upon colonial and municipal *aes* of such 'anniversary' force as is rightly to be distinguished, from time to time, in the central *aes* of Rome, though this impact would normally show a time-lag and (as Grant would seem to admit on occasion) an inevitable change of emphasis.

If this general position is true, then the necessity of seeking an intimate connexion between certain political formulae appropriate at Rome and the character of colonial *aes*, pressed (or implied) by Grant throughout, would of course be weakened. His discussion of the possible relationship between *senatusconsulta* and local coinages (cf. p. 46) appears to be sterile: his section on the imperial auspices, perhaps out of place in this study, is pushed beyond the point of conviction: the strength postulated for Roman anniversaries as an influence on the choice of local types sometimes seems too great; and his comments on *perpetuitas* appear to obscure the essential simplicity of the fact that the *pax Augusta* found in Tiberius only the second *principes*. In one other important respect, too, this able and learned book may be thought to be at fault. Its partial dependence on the theory, developed elsewhere by Grant, that tribunician dating on early imperial *aes* refers to no more than the date of the *senatusconsulta* which originally authorized it renders his arguments in this connexion very suspect, for the 'deferred dating' theory (which can produce strange chaos in Tiberius' *aes*) has perhaps, like a naughty and energetic child, had too wild a frolic, and seems to be in need of a cautionary restraint.

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY AT ROME

Memoirs of the American Academy at Rome. Volume XIX. Pp. 145; 11 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 16s. net.

L. R. TAYLOR and T. R. S. Broughton argue that the order of the consular names in the *Fasti* was determined by priority of election, that alternation of the *fascies* continued throughout the Republic, and that the 'consul prior factus' always held the *fascies* in the first month. These propositions are more reasonable than Mommsen's view, but the case is not really proved. That the order of names in Livy and the *Fasti Capitolini* agrees in over 70 per cent. of the years, while the order in Dionysius and *F.C.* agrees in some 80 per cent. is not

so impressive, since there are after all only two names a year—especially as the authors think Livy more accurate than *F.C.* The implication of a common source is not discussed. Some difficulties admitted in the notes are slurred in the text: Marcellus in 51 and Domitius in 54 invade their colleagues' months, to say nothing of Cicero. The assumption that the holder of the *fascēs* alone could exercise the *ius agendi cum populo* and hold elections is questionable.

H. T. Rowell on the Campanian origin of Naevius labours the obvious, but argues sensibly for the Varronian origin of biographical information about Naevius.

Mason Hammond revises his earlier views about the tribunician day of certain emperors. Following Mattingly (*J.R.S.* xx) he admits that the tribunician and consular dates of military diplomata do not necessarily refer to the same point of time. Hence the element of doubt in theories about tribunician days, based largely on such evidence, increases, except where the flow of new evidence from municipal Fasti removes this new doubt. There is indeed hope, for hardly were Hammond's doubts published than the new Fasti of Potentia emerged to confirm two of his tentative guesses about Domitian. The detailed arguments that characterize this subject here admit only a brief review. Hammond inclines to 30 September for Domitian, leaves the issue open between Mattingly's day in October and Mommsen's 10 December for the final day of Trajan, and for Pius concludes that 'before 147 Antoninus was already using a day earlier than Feb. 25'. One assumption derived from Mattingly is rather odd: that if Antoninus introduced 10 December as the tribunician day, Trajan cannot have done so earlier, and vice versa. The natural thing is for each emperor to begin by dating his tribunician series from his day of adoption or institution, etc., and later to change for reasons of convenience to another day. Hammond fails to notice the valid argument that if Trajan had taken 10 December before A.D. 100 Pliny would not have been silent about this mark of *libertas* in the *Panegyricus*. He also slips in suggesting that Cn. Domitius (who may not be Apollinaris) became consul on 28 January. This would require in the *Fasti Ostienses* the formula 'a.d. v. Kal. Feb.', not '(...) Ian'.

I. S. Ryberg, *The Ara Pacis*, identifies the 'velatus' figure with Agrippa and interprets the sacrificial scene in terms of Ianus, Iuppiter, and Pax.

J. H. Oliver, *On Edict II and the Senatus Consultum from Cyrene*, makes some good epigraphical and bad linguistic observations. He draws attention to the difference between intentional gaps left by the stone-cutter for punctuation, and gaps due to a failure to cut letters after they had been painted on the stone. In the second Edict, 49–51, he proposes to read τοῦτο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ εἶπεν ἐατὼς πεπλάσθαι καὶ ἐψεῦσθαι, φανερόν τε ἐποίησαν. This leaves τοῦτο without an antecedent in the context, and the last clause is rendered very feeble. More probably the text was a translation of a Latin original like: 'cum . . . id quod in provincia dixissent se finxisse planum fecissent'. In dealing with the crux in v. 104–5 ὧν ἂν ἐν τῇ συνκλήτῳ αἰτίας ἐπιφέρουσι ἀκούσθωσι ὅπως, where ἐπιφέρωσι is usually proposed and the last two words inverted, he defends the reading, but posits with others a gap after ὅπως which he fills with ὡσι κριταί. He then explains ὧν as the subject of ἀκούσθωσι. This involves an impossible attraction of the nominative relative into the case of its supposed antecedent ταύτων (sic!), i.e. αἰτιῶν, and an excessively awkward repetition of this latter term twice in the same clause. He regards ἐπιφέρουσι as a dative participle, but does not explain how it construes with the verb. All these obscurities are

supposed to be a translation of the remarkable Latin sentence: 'quae in senatu causas deferentibus audiantur (ut iudices sint earum causarum)'.

C. W. Mendell, *Manuscripts of Tacitus' Minor Works*, argues against the accepted identification of the older portion of the Aesinas with the manuscript reported to have been brought from Hersfeld or Fulda to Rome circa 1455.

A. W. Van Buren publishes minor objects including impasto ware from the collections of the Academy.

Several numerical misprints occur, e.g. VII for VI on p. 50, 46 for 45 on p. 49, and 149 for 148 on p. 62.

St. John's College, Oxford

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE

SHORT REVIEWS

F. KINCHIN SMITH: *The Antigone of Sophocles*. A new dramatic translation. Pp. 68; 1 plate, line drawings. London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1950. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

MR. KINCHIN SMITH's translation of the *Antigone* is intended for performance on the stage. With this in view he has rendered the dialogue into prose, the choral parts into unrhymed verse, and relegated to the notes two passages of especial difficulty for a modern audience, *Antigone's* much suspected speech, 904-20, and all but the first strophe of the last stasimon, because of the exceptional obscurity of its mythology.

The prose dialogue is generally good and natural. The use of the second person singular is restricted to the utterances of Tiresias. But though it reads well, and is as free as anyone could fairly ask from the oddities and unnaturalnesses typical of translation from the ancient tongues, it cannot be denied that it is a little thin. Without the extraordinary richness and distinction of Sophoclean verse the play cannot be quite the same. But even if the ideal translation of the *Antigone* must be poetry, a very good translation, especially for performance on the stage or by the B.B.C., may well be in prose, in which the indispensable clarity and incisiveness are much more easily obtained.

The translator has not always overcome the temptation to compensate for inevitable omissions by inserting more than is in the original: ἀναρῶς λέγεις, 'every word you speak is torture' (316); δαμόνιον τέρας, 'devil's work' (376); οὐ δίκαια ἐξαπαράνοντα

'sinning against the light' (743); ἐκ σοῦ βιάζονται τάδε, 'wouldst thou set thyself up as a god?' (1073). And the famous οἱ τοὶ συνέχθην, ἀλλὰ συμφίλειν ἔφην, is rather distorted as 'to those who love me I give love, to those who hate me I return not hate' (523). The humorous disposition of the Guard is, perhaps justifiably, underlined by the use of colloquial diction absent from the Greek.

The Introduction and Notes are appropriate to the book, and it is to be hoped that the translator's purpose of encouraging the performance of Sophocles will frequently be fulfilled.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

E. DIEHL: *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Fasc. 2. Editio tertia. Pp. viii + 116. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Boards, \$1.97.

THE contents are Theognis, Pseudo-Pythagoras' *carmen aureum*, Pseudo-Phocylides' *sententiae*, Chares (incl. P. Heidelb. 434), and the anonymous *Aulodia* from P. Oxy. 1795. R. Beutler, the editor, has included Diehl's own annotations and some observations from other recent work.

To the bibliography at the head of Theognis add especially J. Carrière, *T. de M.: Etudes sur le recueil élégiaque* etc. There is an extraordinary and, I submit, regrettable novelty in the presentation of Theognis: a very large number of words and word-groups are printed in spaced type. There is an ex-

planation, obscurely phrased: *litteris singulis dilatatis notantur ea verba, quae rebus et cogitationibus Theognideis conglutinandis in primis fungi possunt*. I see darkly what the editor meant to express, and plead that he will never do it again.

This edition offers, as before, not a critical apparatus but a summary report of selected variants. For anything more we must continue to turn to Hudson-Williams and Carrière, until Mr. Young (*C.R.* lxiv, 1950, pp. 14 ff.) gives us the necessary picture of the entire tradition. Meantime it would be well, for future editions of Diehl, to check the alleged readings of cod. A with the source from which they were taken, viz. Hudson-Williams: in at least a few difficult places, where it would be useful to know exactly what stands in A, the information given here is either inexact (e.g. 288) or incomplete (e.g. 632).

The salutary commandments of the *carmen aureum* and Pseudo-Phocylides are presented adequately enough for many of us. Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, pp. 223 ff., should be named at the head of Chares. In the first line of the *Aulodia*, the editor's understandable anxiety to avoid Hunt's διαφρορεῖν has led him to print φ(ε)ῖσαι . . δ νε . . , which needs some correction: φ[ι]σαι διαφρορε[ι]ν Hunt. In v. 11 δ[ωδε]κα should be printed.

The republication of this indispensable *Anthology* is most heartily welcome.

D. L. PAGE

Trinity College, Cambridge

Homer: *The Iliad*. A new translation by E. V. RIEU. Pp. 469. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1950. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

THE Homeric poems possess a beauty and charm which is unique and give an inimitable picture of primitive society. Homer, the earliest poet whose work has survived, is also one of the greatest. No one who has read the two great epics can fail to enjoy them and to wish that everyone else could have the same treat; therefore they must be translated into a modern language since everyone cannot learn Greek. *How* they should be translated has long been a popular literary problem. Dr. Rieu has no doubts on this subject: his answer is 'Produce a translation which can be easily understood and enjoyed'. In order to possess these qualities, it must be, in the first place, in *prose*—the great British public is apt to be 'put off' by verse—and, secondly, it must be written in

good, plain, everyday language, free from anything which is 'quaint' or far-fetched. This Dr. Rieu has done with immense success in his version of the *Odyssey*, which he now follows up with that of the *Iliad*. He has brought the Homeric poems up to date, so that 'he who runs may read' them.

A pedant might urge that Dr. Rieu sometimes paraphrases rather than translates. He might object, for example, that a different metaphor from that which Homer uses has been employed; on consideration, however, it generally turns out that Dr. Rieu's version gives the meaning in English more clearly than would a literal translation of Homeric metaphor, and is therefore justified.

Dr. Rieu's Introduction contains much that is interesting and refreshing. For example, he protests against the way in which those who have studied the *Iliad* most carefully and, therefore, should admire it most, take a delight in picking it to pieces and reducing it to a sort of patchwork composed by writers of different dates. He quite rightly insists that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are the final fruit of a long poetical tradition and that Homer is indebted to his predecessors; there was no such thing as literary copyright in antiquity. There may certainly be occasional inconsistencies, but what else could be expected in such immensely long poems, which were originally handed on by word of mouth only? Moreover, Dr. Rieu does well to emphasize the way in which the poet preserves the consistency of the characters of his dramatis personae.

EDWARD S. FORSTER

Aristophanes: *The Birds*. Translated into English verse, with introduction and notes, by GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 183. London: Allen & Unwin 1950. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

DR. GILBERT MURRAY, who has already given us a version of the *Frogs*, has chosen the *Birds* as the second comedy of Aristophanes for translation into English. Though possibly everyone will not agree with him when he says that 'the *Birds* is not perhaps the funniest of Aristophanes' plays, yet it is by general agreement the most delightful; there can be no doubt that the two chief characters, Pithetaerus and Euelpides, find themselves in circumstances which will enlist the sympathies of many Englishmen of the present day. Sick of high prices, excessive taxation, and the restrictions which make life in war-worn Athens hard to bear, they

set out to find some place where they can live in peace, and guided by a crow and a jackdaw they visit the court of Tereus, formerly King of Thrace and now King of the Birds, to whom they propose the great scheme of building Cloudcuckopolis in such a position in the sky as to cut off communication between the inhabitants of earth and those of heaven. The complications which arise between the gods and the inhabitants of the new state are highly entertaining and make us wonder at the disrespectful way in which the Athenians could talk of their deities. The interpretation of the play has been a matter of considerable discussion, but most readers of the *Birds* will be content to enjoy this admirable version without troubling their heads about such controversies.

The play necessarily must lose a good deal through the absence of the important adjuncts of scenery, dresses, and music, and, like all Aristophanes' comedies, it contains many contemporary allusions the points of which are difficult for moderns to grasp, but Dr. Murray shows great skill in bringing them out clearly and explaining them in the notes at the end of the book, and, as in all his translations, his renderings of the lyrics, which are a special feature of the *Birds*, have a particular charm.

EDWARD S. FORSTER

LEONARD NELSON: *Socratic Method and Critical Philosophy*. Selected Essays. Pp. xxii+211. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 30s. net.

THE essays in this volume are selected from the work of Leonard Nelson, a German philosopher who died in 1927 at the age of forty-five. Believing that Kant was essentially right in making the work of philosophy consist in the discovery and justification of the standards implicit in our thinking, he sought to put into practice the Socratic method of instruction. With the theory of this method the initial essay is concerned. Nelson writes well and seems to have been a forceful personality. His remarks apply, of course, to the situation in his own country at the time of writing, but are by no means devoid of general interest. The translation (by Thomas K. Brown, using the work of previous translators) reads well, and the Foreword by Professor Blanshard brings out clearly the relevance of the essays to the problems of today.

THE author's thesis in the first study, from which the title is taken, is this: that dogmatic assertion should be absolutely excluded from philosophical teaching and that the class should not only work out the answers, but first frame the questions for itself. The instructor's aim should be, not exactly to remove all external influence, which is impossible, but to 'weaken the influences that obstruct the growth of philosophical comprehension and reinforce those that promote it'. Nelson insists here on the importance of clear expression, and holds that the instructor should refuse to entertain for discussion a proposition that is incoherently formulated. I wonder whether this last is a Socratic trait; and the essay as a whole gives rise to a host of questions. Have we any warrant for transforming Socrates' highly personal type of inquiry into a general pedagogic method? Nelson says, citing the *Apology*, that Socrates questioned and cross-examined others, not to convey a new truth to them in the manner of an instructor, but to point out the path along which it might be found. Plato, however, makes him say that he did this in order to test the oracle which proclaimed him the wisest of men. In the *Meno* the method of questioning is used with reference to a Sophistic paradox about the impossibility of learning. In the *Theaetetus* Socrates says that he is a midwife, but not that every instructor in philosophy should be one. Kant's critical method was not thus personal. Nelson is right, no doubt, in his condemnation of the systematic sort of philosophical teaching, which he had probably seen at close quarters. He does not seem to be aware that the maieutic method also may have its dangers in the hands of instructors who, for the fun of the thing, clear out the furniture of the student's mind.

D. J. ALLAN

University of Edinburgh

AEMILIA LEDYARD SHIELDS: *Averrois Cordubensis Compendia librorum Aristotelis qui Parva Naturalia vocantur*. (Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem: Versionum Latinarum Volumen VII.) Pp. xxxiv+276. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1949. Cloth, \$10 (\$8 to members of the Academy).

THIS volume forms part of the *Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi*, being vol. vii in the series of Averroes' compendia of works of Aristotle,

itself part of a larger collection of Aristotle's works as found in Latin translations of Averroes' reproductions. (For the scheme, see H. A. Wolfson in *Speculum*, vol. vi (1931), pp. 412-27.) 'Compendium' is a slightly misleading title for this series of Aristotelian essays, covering the matter of *Parv. Nat.* to the end of *De Longaev.*: (1) *De Sens.*, (2) *De Mem.*, (3) *De Sompno et Vigilia* (covering Arist. *De Somno*, *De Insomniis*, and *De Div. per Somn.*), (4) *De Long. et Brev. Vitae*. Completed in 1170, it was translated into Hebrew in 1254; there are two Latin versions, the better known attributed by several scholars to Michael Scot (rather than Gerard of Cremona, whom one manuscript names as translator), the other, here called the *versio Parisina*, found only in Bibl. Nat. lat. 16222. It follows the vulgate fairly closely for *De Sens.* and *De Mem.*, but diverges more widely thereafter.

This is the first time the *Compendium* has been printed since the Juntine edition of 1550; 8 manuscripts of the *versio vulgata* have been completely collated, together with the editions of (?) 1474 and 1550, and 32 partially. The introduction describes the manuscripts, Latin, Hebrew, and Arabic, and there follows the text in both versions (the Parisian being printed for the first time), with a full apparatus including the readings presupposed by three Arabic manuscripts (two of them in Hebrew characters) and eight Hebrew. There is a full Latin index giving Arabic and Hebrew equivalents, followed by a Graeco-Latin index.

Parv. Nat. is a particularly corrupt and obscure section of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, and this compendium may well repay detailed study. Scholars will note that on p. 53 passages from *An. I* 2 are ascribed to the end of *B*; this presupposes a division of books at, perhaps, 429^a9, of which there are traces as early as the genuine commentary of Philoponus on *An. I*, which begins there in the Latin translation published by de Corte (Liège-Paris, 1934). Parallel passages from Aristotle and other authors (including Pl. *Apol.* 20 d-e) are quoted, though there might be more (at p. 6, add 437^b22; at p. 129, to 464^b19-20 add 433-465^a2); three allusions are to passages excised in the Teubner editions, *An.* 428^a22-4 (retained by J. A. Smith) and 464^b19-20 and 29-30. The reference on p. 113 assigned to Acts ix. 3-9 is more probably to 2 Cor. xii. 1-4. At p. 139, l. 7, for *vita* read *vite*. On p. 267, for *instrumentum*, *sensus* read *instrumentum sensus*.

The book is admirably produced.

D. A. REES

University College, Bangor

Nouum Testamentum Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi. Partis Tertiae Fasciculus Secundus. Epistulas Iacobi, Petri, Iudae recensuit H. F. D. SPARKS, Epistulas Iohannis recensuit A. W. ADAMS. Pp. 177. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Paper, 21s. net.

WITH this fascicule, which appeared sixty years after that containing Matthew, the end of the Oxford edition of the Vulgate New Testament is in sight. Like its predecessors it contains the text of the Vulgate as critically established, most of the ancient *praefationes*, *argumenta*, and series of *capitula* for these epistles, and, most important of all, the fullest apparatus criticus for the history of this part of the Latin Bible. What is this history? In the title of the fascicule before us we read *secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi*, but no one would insist on this phrase with the same assurance for the Catholic Epistles as for the Gospels. We have, in this part of the New Testament, Vulgate *codices* such as *Amiatinus* and *Fuldensis* and forms of the Old Latin differing in varying degrees from the Vulgate. Harnack showed that in James our Vulgate itself was a form of the Old Latin but slightly revised. Revision of the Latin Bible seems to have been continuous from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century. All we can say is that very often our Vulgate, whoever the precise author of particular books, stands at the end, or near the end, of this process of revision.

The importance of the apparatus is not confined to the history of the Latin Epistles. Many of the variants reproduce readings in the Greek. If we cannot at once point to a Greek original for all Latin variants, it does not follow that such Greek originals never existed for any of them. Here the evidence of vol. ii of Wordsworth and White is important. For many Latin variants in that volume no Greek evidence was known until the discovery of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles (P⁴⁶). We have no P⁴⁶ for the Catholic Epistles. The reason why we know of no Greek equivalents for a number of Latin readings in these epistles may be merely that the Greek equivalent has not come down to us, not that it never existed. Thus the Latin may sometimes alone preserve information on the history of the Greek text in general. This, of course, does not apply to variants internal to the Latin such as *nam* and *enim*.

In such a mass of detail it is inevitable that there should be errors. In the heading at the

top of page 267 *Prima* should be *Primam*. The fragment of the Latin of 3 John in *Codex Bezae* has not been used. The series of *capitula* for James in Casanatensis 723 and Pistoia 124 is absent. There are Old Latin *marginalia* in Archivio Catedralicio MS. 15 (saec. vii) and S. Isidoro *Codex Gothicus Legionensis* (A.D. 960), both in León. Throughout 1 Jn. iii. 8 'Cypr.' seems to stand for the *De Alatoribus*, but, if this is so, it had not *adventurus* but *uenturus* according to all the editions known to me. At 1 Pet. ii. 23, Ambrose *De Officiis* (Krabinger's edition) i. 21. 93, read *remaledixit*, and at 1 Pet. ii. 24, Pseudo-Jerome's Interpolations to Pelagius at 1 Cor. xi. 8 (*Texts and Studies*, ix. 3, p. 30), read *portavit*. Tyconius in *Spicilegium Casinense* iii. i. 265 should have been quoted at 1 Pet. v. 21.

We are all greatly indebted to the editors. They are to be congratulated on their work and the Clarendon Press on its publication.

G. D. KILPATRICK

Queen's College, Oxford

ROBERT WILDE: *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries*. (Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXXI.) Pp. xviii + 239. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Paper.

THIS Ph.D. dissertation begins by giving a sketch of the historical background, particularly of the foreign relations of the Hebrew people from the seventh century B.C. down to the days of the early Roman Empire. This is followed by another sketch, based mainly on Reinach, of the treatment accorded to the Jews in Greek writers from Theophrastus to Porphyry. These preliminaries occupy pp. 1-77. The rest of the book is devoted to the main topic. Here the ground is well covered, and important documents such as Justin's *Dialogue*, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and Origen's *c. Celsum* receive extended treatment. It is a useful beginning in a field where there is still much to be done, but it is a long way from being the last word on the subject. Among other points of detail which call for revision or correction the following may be mentioned.

P. 15. The view that Menelaus was not of priestly birth has lately been challenged by F. M. Abel in *Miscellanea G. Mercati*, i. 52-8 and in his edition of the books of *Maccabees* (p. 316 ad 2 Macc. iii. 4).

P. 50. According to Nicolas of Damascus

Ἀβράμουν οἰκίους is not the name of a street but of a village in the Damascene territory (Thomsen, *Loca Sancta*, p. 14).

P. 54. On Chaeremon of Alexandria cf. H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, p. 29 (ad p. Lond. 1912, l. 17).

P. 177. For 'psaltery' read 'psalmody'. And on p. 175 for 'Tollington' read 'Tollinton'.

P. 211, n. 261. Read *De Sanguisuga*.

P. 212, n. 1 says that Funk's Latin text of the *Didascalia* 'is probably closer to the original Greek, now lost, than the Syriac is'. This is possibly true of those parts of Funk's text which rest on the Verona palimpsest—about two-fifths of the whole. The remainder of Funk's Latin is simply a translation from the Syriac. It would have been better if Dr. Wilde had made use of Dom Connolly's edition of the *Didascalia*.

P. 212 n. 3. *Didasc.* vi. 17 will not support the inference that the author of the book was a convert from Judaism. The language is merely what the compiler of the *Didascalia* thought proper to be used by the putative authors of the book, the original Apostles, who were, of course, of Jewish extraction.

It may be hoped that Dr. Wilde will continue his researches in this field. He has brought together a large collection of material, and there is still much to be done in sifting and interpreting it. The more laborious part of the task is largely accomplished: the most difficult part still has to be tackled, and one feels that Dr. Wilde's familiarity with the material should give him a flying start.

T. W. MANSON

University of Manchester

GUIDO MÜLLER: *Lexicon Athanasianum*. Lieferungen 1-5. [To be completed in 10 parts of about 80 pp. each.] Berlin: de Gruyter, 1944, 1949-50. Paper, DM. 30 each part.

AS can be seen from the treatment of words like *ἐνανθρωπείν*, *ἐνανθρώπησις* in this lexicon, the vocabulary of Athanasius is as important for the student of the christology of the Ancient Church as for the student of its trinitarian doctrine. But it would be a mistake to regard the importance of the *Lexicon* as limited to these matters. If in following the Arian controversies we look up *ἀνόμιος*, we find under the word a reference to Manichaeism. *ἀσκειν*, *ἀσκησις* are already technical terms for monasticism. It might have been noted that *ἀκηδία*, *ἀκηδιᾶν* already belong to

the same technical vocabulary, particularly as Athanasius wrote at a time when the language of monasticism was being formed. The *Lexicon* can also guide us to Athanasius' exegesis of Biblical words and passages such as *ἐνοούσιος* (Mt. vi. 11), *ἐκόν* (Col. i. 15). Furthermore, it includes proper names, a fact which makes it of value to the secular as well as to the ecclesiastical historian. An undertaking which must profit considerably from it is the Patristic Lexicon now being compiled at Oxford.

The text followed is that of Migne except for von der Goltz's edition of the *de Virginitate*. It is regrettable that the Berlin edition could not have been used, but, apart from the enormous labour of adjusting the *Lexicon* to this instead of to Migne, there is the further difficulty that the Berlin edition is far from complete and we do not know when it will be finished. It is, however, a pity that Ludwig's critical edition of the *Epistula ad Epictetum* (Jena, 1911) and at least Robinson's edition of the *de Incarnatione* were not employed. Casey's discussion of the shorter recension of this treatise appeared too late to be used.

Students of ancient Christianity and the later Empire must be grateful to Father Müller, to the Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte, and to the publishers for this admirable tool of scholarship.

G. D. KILPATRICK

Queen's College, Oxford

A. I. AMATUCCI: T. Macci Plauti *Rudens*. Pp. xiv + 103. Turin: Paravia, 1949. Paper, L. 500.

THIS addition to the Corpus Paravianum suffers from an editor all too often stone-deaf to Plautine rhythm. His line 969, a trochaic septenarius, ends '... dominus huic? [nemo], ne frustrassis'. The apparatus reports Gruter's correction, yet defiantly Amatucci writes: 'frustrassis ego cum libris recentioribus (cf. *Men.* 692 cd)¹, sc. me'. This metrical enormity is actually quoted on line 1255. So '... volt eripere ingratus' at the end of 772 cannot, with the right reading duly reported among the variants, be a quirk of editorial acrasia; it is a relief that in 1399 his suggestion '... tibi munis sistis' only disfigures the apparatus.

Nor is he happier in iambic septenarii. Bentley's transposition saved the metre of 1310; Amatucci mentions this, but prints the line unemended. By what artifice does he scan

it? In 1382 another transposition as old as Priscian is disdained; *natus annos* there gives an iambus in the fourth foot—or can it be a *brevis brevians* awful beyond contemplation? In 272 *sumus ambae* must form the third foot of a cretic tetrameter, with hiatus after it; Bentley's *simus* cured all long ago.

Milder stricture is apposite for genuinely controversial passages. In 313/5 it may be wiser to acquiesce in Ernout's despairing asterisks than in Lindsay's expedients, but Amatucci's 313 (iambic septenarius) will only scan if the sixth foot is *astatis expedite*. This might be, but 314 produces two novel synizeses and 315 runs: *clamidatos duceret cūm machaeris, vidistis venientem?*

This freak fourth foot accompanies a ghoulish accentual clash at the line-end. Other flaws include the ruining of the pun² in 767 and misprints in the text at 16, 318, 731, and 1354.

Yet some things are right. Testimonia and apparatus are full and sufficiently reliable to suggest that the editor's intentions are perhaps sounder than his shortcomings might indicate. His view of hiatus is sensible, and he is not carried away by such things as Marx's arbitrary line-transpositions in the prologue. He has an interest in orthography, believing that in Plautus' day some inflexions (e.g. *-umus* and *-imus*) were fluid. He is aware of the difficulties of reconstructing a text earlier than that of the scholars of the late republic, but does not always see when Plautus' practice may be inferred from special considerations.³

Of over twenty conjectures I have noticed, those in 191 <ego>, 196 *sciam* <iam>, 1008-9 *exsugere* . . . -ebo, 1132 <re plana pla>, 1138 <iniurium>, are the most worth considering. More adventurous are 205 *compotis sum*, 927 *te extempulo praeter te*, (sc. *adiuvante fortuna*), 1169 *silicula* (dimin. of *siliqua*). The remainder are, to me, unconvincing or open to objection: e.g. *atqui* in 22 (*atque* can carry a sufficiently adversative force), 287 (here admittedly the split anapaest in lyric iambic may be defended⁴ by St. 769), 457 <subest> (but this gives double iambic), 481 <sis> (odd after *heus*), 666 <anicula> (too affectionate a word for Palaestra to use of

² Cf. C.R. xviii. 402.

³ e.g. the form *vester* in 82. Amatucci would not deny this to Pl., and it would explain the corruption, but the archaic phrasing of similar sentiments at the end of other prologues such as *Capt.* 68 argues, in my judgement, for the -o- form here.

⁴ Cf. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse*, p. 92.

¹ What, by the way, does that prove?

the dignified priestess), 864 (I doubt *tibin*, especially after *equividem*), 1307 *alii* (but *alii* refers to Charmides). He has some possible defences of the tradition, though over-ready to invoke current Italian, but is perverse at, for example, 146 (see *Trin.* 1057 and B.-N.-Conrad for dative), 150 (no mention of Macrobian ii. 2. 4 or Festus 334 L.), 750 (scansion of -ā 1st Decl.) and elsewhere.

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

Jesus College, Oxford

LEONARDO FERRERO: *Poetica Nuova in Lucrezio*. Pp. viii+191. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Paper, L. 550.

NEITHER in sense nor in style is the *De Rerum Natura* like the works of the Alexandrian poets or of their Roman followers who wrote in the first century B.C. Accordingly Lucretius has usually been regarded as standing aloof from the poets of his time, though there is evidence that he could have written the fashionable sort of hexameter had he chosen. But it may well be that if we possessed more of the literature of the period, Lucretius would not appear so completely isolated from his contemporaries. Signor Ferrero has tried to construct a picture of the literary activities of the time, and to show that Lucretius can almost be numbered among the 'neoterics', that, like them, he put charm and conciseness high among his aims, and sought ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν δεῖδεν. The discussion is inevitably somewhat nebulous, dealing largely with attitudes and tendencies and hypothetical 'programmes', and it is not easy reading. That Ferrero should prove his case is hardly possible, given the nature and quantity of the evidence, but he makes a number of points which deserve attention. But it is going rather far to quote Catullus' purely exclamatory *quid moraris emori?* as evidence that he suffered, like Lucretius, from *taedium vitae*.

When he comes to deal with the verbal resemblances which have been noted in the works of Lucretius and Catullus Ferrero shows a judicious restraint and sees them mainly as a natural consequence of the tradition which was common to both.

An English reader of this book can hardly fail to be struck by the number of references to recent Italian work on the literature of the Roman Republic, much of it unknown in this country; conversely Ferrero had been unable at the time of finishing his manuscript to see a copy of Cyril Bailey's edition of Lucretius.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

4598.3/4

ANDRIES BOLHUIS: *Vergilius' Vierde Ecloga in de Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum*. Pp. 86. Ermelo: P. Bolhuis, 1950. Paper.

THE oration in question is generally printed as a sort of appendix to Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*, and opinions have differed as to whether it was in any sense composed by Constantine himself, or by Eusebius, or by some third hand. This dissertation, the fruit of no little reading and thought, throws a side-light on the question. Three chapters of the oration (19-21) contain a very bad, tendentious, and dishonest translation into Greek hexameters of part of the Fourth Eclogue, accompanied by a sort of commentary which interprets it on familiar lines as a prophecy, derived from knowledge of the Sibyl, of the birth of Christ. The question discussed is whether the author of the commentary had in mind the translation or the original; for if he knew the original and made any reference to it, he may have been Constantine or at least some educated Westerner, but if he knew only the Greek version, he presumably was not.

Bolhuis subjects the verses and the accompanying interpretation to a minute analysis, the upshot of which is to confirm what even a hasty inspection must suggest to any unprejudiced reader, namely that the author knew nothing of Virgil's own text, or at all events betrays no acquaintance with it. There are several passages which could not have been written by anyone with the original in his head, none which prove any knowledge of Latin, though some are not inconsistent with it. Some details of reading and interpretation are uncertain and likely to remain so; the manuscript tradition is poor and it is not clear just to what lengths of bad metre the versifier was capable of going.

A synopsis in English is provided at the end of the Dutch text.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

The Transformations of Lucius, otherwise known as the Golden Ass by Lucius Apuleius. Translated by ROBERT GRAVES. Pp. 298. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1950. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

THE merits of this spirited work are not those of exact scholarship. Both in the Introduction and in the translation Mr. Graves shows

little acquaintance with modern work, and he falls into such simple traps as the old misinterpretation of *Milesiae conditorem* in iv. 32. In easier things too his knowledge of Latin is sometimes at fault: *cruciatus*, for example, in iv. 11, means 'agony', not 'crucifixion', and refers not to future punishment but to present suffering. In the Introduction he goes to extravagant lengths both in overstressing the religious element in the earlier books and in identifying author and hero. Some of his assertions are gratuitously false, for instance, the note on p. 20 'The Inquisition was very hot against the book and succeeded in mutilating all the editions except the Editio Princeps'. Perhaps he is thinking of the early translations, which in this matter certainly lack his own praise-worthy frankness: the text of the Princeps was copied un mutilated for centuries.

In fairness, however, it must be admitted that most of this matters little enough to the ordinary reader. Unlike many of his predecessors, Mr. Graves knows what he is at, and translates on a definite theory. He considers that 'paradoxically, the effect of oddness is best achieved in convulsed times like the present by writing in as easy and sedate an English as possible'. This is perhaps an arguable position and there is something to be said for a simple style, but the loss is great. In the main run of the narrative the reader of this translation gets no inkling of one of the greatest charms of the original, its piquantly unsuitable magniloquence of description and discourse, and its splendid heroics, fantastically embroidered with every device of rhetoric, and then sent crashing to earth with an inimitable twist of final bathos. Still, the task of an Apuleian translator is desperately difficult, and the story as told here is readable and gripping. In the last book the translation rises to real eloquence and as a whole it does communicate at least one of the author's enchanting excellencies: for that Mr. Graves deserves a large measure of gratitude. A short appendix translates the first half-dozen chapters of the *Λούκιος ἡ Όνος*, which Mr. Graves evidently supposes to be, as it stands, an authentic work of Lucian.

D. S. ROBERTSON

Trinity College, Cambridge

J. M. VIS: *Tertullianus' de Pallio tegen de achtergrond van zijn overige werken*. Pp. 147. Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1949. Paper.

THE thesis here maintained, with much learning and a wide knowledge of Tertul-

lian's writings, is that in spite of differences in style, contents, and tone which distinguish it (never to its advantage) from the rest of his works, this address to the Carthaginians proceeds directly from that pride and will to prevail which are the essential Tertullian. The classical scholar will find in chapter i some interesting observations on reading aloud and on translation and a competent Dutch version of the first section of the Latin text. The author protests that it is never possible to take Tertullian anything but seriously. Yet one's impression remains that, even if the joke is somewhat heavy-handed, it is still a joke. In the course of a long section on *pikanterien* it seems to be assumed (unless the reviewer's knowledge of Dutch is at fault) that there is something particularly unseemly in the sentence, *hyena, si observet, sexus annalis est, marem et feminam alternat*: it treats sexual mysteries with less gravity than is due.

Tertullian's *de Pallio* is a very learned *tour de force*. It assembles in brief space an amazing array of obscure erudition on a multitude of subjects. It is also a very fine piece of Latin prose composition. Salmasius produced an even more learned commentary on it. But let Tertullian have his joke. It is not his only one, though there is less malice in this than in some of the others.

E. EVANS

PHOTEINE P. BOURBOULIS: *Apollo Delphinios*. (Λαογραφία, Παράρτημα 5.) Pp. 81. Thessalonica, 1949. Paper.

THIS is a useful monograph, characterized by conscientious study of all available sources of information and interpretation, also by good common sense, which keeps the author clear of numerous ill-grounded theories, although at one point (p. 74) she slips into an old error and imagines that agones originate from funeral ritual. She considers, first, the ancient sources which mention (Apollo) Delphinios, or a month or place called Delphinios (-on), or a festival Delphinia, and collects them handily; next, the views, sound or crazy, of various moderns concerning the meaning of the epithet or name; then the myths, with especial reference to those preserved in the 'Homeric' Hymn to the Pythian Apollo and in the Attic traditions regarding Theseus; after this the problems connected with the god in question, and finally the little that is known of his cult.

As must happen to any honest researcher where the material is so scanty and antiquity

speak
sions
part.
the F
like
that i
Conc
adher
its ob
She s
Attica
rather
where
Attica
it with
guiding
Apoll
(p. 59)
hold t
Athen
plausi
marke
63 ff.)
the Ai

Univers

D. M
Olynth
1934
plates
Press
Press)

THIS v
1934 a
An imm
ing and
as they
boxes a
the pro
illustra
most l
which h
conside
photogr
1,124 b
ments
stretch
century
thing fr
ordinar
the larg
and ord
catalogu
cult it is
a secure
The pla
discussin

speaks with so doubtful a voice, her conclusions are of a provisional nature for the most part. Thus, she frankly admits (p. 34) that the Hymn cannot be dated with anything like certainty, though her own opinion is that it may be as old as the eighth century. Concerning the meaning of Delphinios, she adheres, and rightly, to those who take it in its obvious sense, 'he of the dolphin' (p. 49). She supposes that it originated very early in Attica, 'home of the Ionians' (p. 47; I had rather say, in an Ionian environment somewhere, and therefore one with which early Attica had connexions). She would connect it with the dolphin as a friendly creature, guiding colonists or other navigators, as Apollo in dolphin shape did his Cretans (p. 59). As to the festivals, she is of those who hold that the ceremonial of Munichion 6 at Athens was called Delphinia, and gives plausible reasons for supposing that it marked the beginning of navigation (pp. 63 ff.). She collects the few facts known about the Aiginetan and other cults.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

D. M. ROBINSON: *Excavations at Olynthus. Part XIII: Vases found in 1934 and 1938*. Pp. xix+463; 267 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, £10 net.

THIS volume contains vases excavated in 1934 and 1938 and supplements *Olynthus V*. An immense work had to be done in re-sorting and re-mending these vases after the war, as they had been hurriedly packed away in boxes and buried. Some records were lost in the process, and hence some fragments are illustrated but not described. Our first word must be gratitude for the great labour which has been performed in presenting this considerable mass of pottery in usable photographs: the numbering runs up to 1,124 but many of the numbers cover fragments of twelve or more vases. The time-stretch is from the seventh to the fourth century B.C. and the vases include everything from the finest Athenian red-figure to ordinary cooking-pots. No one will object to the large number of photographs of small and ordinary pots: anyone who has tried to catalogue a local museum knows how difficult it is to find parallels, and Olynthus gives a secure bottom date and sometimes more. The plates are preceded by an introduction discussing the whole range of vases found at

Olynthus and detailed descriptions of each piece. I add some random notes and queries. P. 12: '198 A, B, D, E, F date before 475 B.C.', but reference to pl. 116 shows that only D can do so; F is there dated 360/50. Pl. 28, 4: Herakles and Kerberos? Pl. 33-5: p. 75, 'perhaps from the Persian destruction of 480 B.C.'; p. 81: 'before 479 when the conflagration at the time of Artabazus took place': it looks later. P. 83, middle 'second half of the fourth century' seems to be an error for 'first half'. P. 87, No. 32: it would be useful to note when thyrsi are black and to give a reference to Beazley's thyrsus painter; so also on Nos. 38, 303B. P. 100, No. 48: 'man with child and two men'. Could it be Telephos? P. 110, pl. 74-6: is it quite certain that this is not a pyxis? Something has gone wrong with the description at the top of p. 112. Robinson rightly raises the date of Scheffold, *U.*, No. 188, but it was found in Alexandria. Beazley argued for the earlier dating of the Theophrastus Panathenaic in *A.J.A.* xlvii. 462. P. 124: admirable discussion of fish plates: these should be tied up with Middle Comedy. P. 136, No. 82: very interesting relief lekythos, interpreted as Prokne and Itys. Pl. 116, 198: Pan rather than satyr? Pl. 121, 203m: surely these are wings rather than palmettes? Pl. 132, No. 204: Theseus still seems to me more likely because of the old man at the side. Beazley dates 350/40. As these are from Mecyberna, presumably the 348 limit need not apply. P. 276: I cannot follow the argument and doubt if such precise dating of these little vases is possible. P. 301, 558 A, 2-4: three small skyphoi are called pre-Persian, but appear to be at least as late as No. 571, which is dated end of fifth century or early fourth century.

T. B. L. WEBSTER

University College, London

HEINZ KÄHLER: *Wandlungen der antiken Form*. Pp. 80; 48 plates, 11 diagrams in text. Munich: Münchner Verlag, 1949. Cloth, DM. 18.00.

DR. KÄHLER compares classical architecture, grouping of buildings, and sculpture in stone at various stages in their evolution from the sixth century B.C. to the sixth century A.D. He points out the obvious differences and explains them by the evolving self-consciousness of the artist and his public. The text is seasoned with the fashionable terms of German aesthetic criticism, but is generally honest. The illustrations, good in themselves, are relevant and unhackneyed. The

paper and production reach pre-war standards. This is a handsome but slight work, designed for cultured Germans: it has little appeal for foreigners.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT: *The Symbolism of the House Door in Classical Poetry*. Pp. ix+158. New York and Toronto: Longmans, 1950. Cloth, \$3.

It is fairly obvious that the various equivalents of 'door' have, especially in poetry, associations and connotations more or less complicated and extensive. It is at present the fashion in some circles to speak of 'symbolism' in such a context, a word which the reviewer deprecates as smacking too much of quackery and mystery-mongering, ancient and modern, literary, magico-religious, and psychological. The authoress, who was formerly Professor of Latin at Vassar, has collected a number of examples of such 'symbolic' uses, adding, in my opinion, some which are not there. After an introductory chapter which takes examples ranging from Gilgamesh to T. S. Eliot, she treats first of the door in Tragedy. She finds that 'as tragedy became more and more motivated by crimes of sex, the door becomes more and more important as the symbol of the home and the family' (p. 20). I do not think the examples adduced prove anything of the kind. The next chapter deals with Aristophanes, and hardly throws much light on the subject by saying that Peace is fetched out of her 'prison-cave-door' (p. 47) or finding that at the end of the *Birds* the question whether the union of Peisetairos and Basileia will 'keep the door of heaven open' is left unsolved (p. 51). Next comes 'the door as a character in Plautus' comedies' (chap. iv), which shows good appreciation of the comedian's merits, but somewhat darkens counsel by such remarks as 'the house door stands for nothing except intrigue' (sc. in *Miles Gloriosus*, p. 81), while on p. 87 *Mercator* 830 ff. is handled with no mention of the fact that to a Roman the door which Charinus addresses was associated with the cult of Ianus and other godlings. Chapter v, on Theocritean doors, has to make Amaryllis' cave-entrance in Id. 3 into a door and include the spurious No. 23 to increase the scanty material. The next chapter gets its themes from the Anthology, including the obvious παρακλαυσιθύρα, but once more im-

ports into the text rather more 'doors' than are really there; thus, on p. 113, the rendering of vii. 182 introduces a 'door of the dead' where Meleagros speaks of a road. Something of the same tendency persists into the next chapter, on Latin poets; for instance, on p. 126, Lydia, in Horace, C. iii. 9. 20, is 'ready to open her door', when actually it is her lover who is thinking of opening his. Ovid has a chapter (viii) to himself, in which we learn among other things that 'the door motif is a substratum' to the letters between Acontius and Cydippe (p. 142). Her room and the door of it are mentioned two or three times in nearly 500 lines, naturally enough, as she is supposed to be bedridden; the leading motif is the famous inscribed apple. The last chapter, which sums up the book, also adds two or three interesting examples of 'symbolic' doors in art, but does not justify the exaggerations which mar the rest of the book.

The whole is an example of the extent to which a writer of scholarly accomplishments, wide reading, and, as several incidental criticisms show, of taste on the whole good, can be misled by a false guide followed too trustfully.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

C. G. BROUZAS: *Byron's Maid of Athens: her Family and Surroundings*. (Philological Papers No. 7.) Pp. 65; 4 plates. Morgantown, W.Va.: University of West Virginia, 1949. Paper.

As far as one can gather, the author of this monograph sets out to establish a family tree for Teresa Macri, Byron's 'Maid of Athens'. In the process he discovers that her family hailed from Corfu, 'but', he adds, 'there were many persons by that name, probably not at all related to the same family'. Indeed, a page-long footnote dealing with a host of other Macris, active in various parts of Greece from 1486 onwards, and not in the least related to Teresa's family, takes care of that point. We learn also that Teresa's paternal grandfather had five daughters of whom 'the last, doubtless the youngest, Theodora, was 34 years old and unmarried when Byron and Hobhouse were in Athens'. Through her mother she was related to a certain Dr. Bretos whose name, we are told in another learned footnote, 'has nothing to do with the classical word βρέτας'. That the Macris were a cultured family can be de-

duced from the fact that they were related to the Logothetae of Athens who, it is pointed out, had 'one of the finest houses in town, where even such things as English knives and forks were to be found'. Similarly, the family background of Mr. James Black, the English gentleman who subsequently married Teresa, as well as his 'character before he married' her, is scrutinized, and we are assured that he too 'had a father whose name was also James'; so the author goes on until every member of the Macri family is dealt with individually. Cumber-some footnotes on a great variety of points ranging from the 'epigramme' under Byron's monument in Missolonghi and the brand of tobacco which Mr. Black smoked to the mental agonies the author himself went through while writing this book, strive to give to this curious work an air of serious learning. The Latin in the dedication is almost unintelligible, and the attempt to correct in the errata-slip the misquoted verse from Horace has been unsuccessful. And why the author should insist on translating the Greek name Panaghiotis into Peter is beyond comprehension.

S. J. PAPASTAVROU

Pembroke College, Cambridge

FREDERICK S. BOAS: *Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies*. Pp. 212. London: Allen & Unwin, 1950. 15s. net.

This volume contains a number of essays and addresses, of which two especially concern the classical student. One, *Ovid and the Elizabethans*, has already been distributed to members of the Classical Association. The other, and more important, is the 1943 Shakespeare lecture to the British Academy entitled *Aspects of Classical Legend and History in Shakespeare*.

Dr. Boas has always been a friend to classical studies, and this cannot but predispose us in his favour. And I am glad to say that with his conclusion, that Shakespeare's first-hand acquaintance with ancient literature was extremely limited, I am in entire agreement. I might add that it was the conclusion of Richard Farmer, whom Dr. Boas does not mention, merely adducing his evidence.

As for the essays themselves, it is with genuine regret that I must say, since my opinion has been asked, that I do not think they will do. They are full of misunderstandings, inaccuracies, and statements

badly expressed. Mere printers' errors, which are rather numerous, I would not count against a man in these days of hurried printing. One I especially regretted, 'William Herbert, or whoever (*sic*) he was addressing' (p. 58). The attribution of *Cambyse* to Richard Preston (p. 64) we may reasonably suppose a mere lapse of memory. But what is one to say of other statements? In the limited space at my disposal I can deal with only some. These it seems best to take from the British Academy lecture, in which one naturally looks for a high level of scholarship.

In speaking of Shakespeare's 'humanist outfit', which I take to mean his classical knowledge, Dr. Boas says (p. 72) that 'its basis was of course laid at Stratford-on-Avon Grammar School'. He says 'of course', although we do not know that Shakespeare went to Stratford Grammar School, or, if he did, how long he stayed there, or what he learned. He speaks (p. 74) of Jupiter's 'creative power', as if Jupiter (or Zeus) were the Creator. He says (p. 75) that 'the pure-minded Juliet can scarcely have known such stories' as that of Io. To say nothing of the fact that Juliet can quote from the *Ars Amatoria*, what educated Renaissance girl did not know the stories in the *Metamorphoses*? What of Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*? On the same page he observes, 'Another of Jupiter's transformations . . . was his lodging in the shape of a servant with the rustic couple, Philemon and Baucis'. But Ovid says nothing of the kind. He refers (p. 88) to Benoît de Saint More—Saint for Sainte. He says (p. 97) 'Octavius succeeds to the role of Julius, of whom Shakespeare, to emphasize their kinship, makes him not the nephew but the son. And the fact that throughout the play'—*Antony and Cleopatra*—'he is called simply Caesar indicates etc.'. Shakespeare does this! Yet there is such a thing as Roman history, and there is Plutarch's *Life of Antony*, which, as everybody knows, Shakespeare followed with extreme fidelity, not even making Dr. Boas's mistake of calling Octavius the nephew of Caesar.

Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to hear that I am mistaken in these criticisms. Indeed it may be that I am sometimes misled by Dr. Boas's way of expressing himself. 'Althaea was in truth not merely in a dream delivered of a fire-brand, like Hecuba before the birth of Paris' (p. 83). He has sentences like that, and I confess that from an eminent English scholar I did not expect them.

J. A. K. THOMSON

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLVI. 2: APRIL 1951

L. R. Taylor, *New Indications of Augustan Editing in the Fasti Capitolini*: notes variations from the 'republican tradition' (represented by Livy and the *Fasti Feriarum Latinarum*) in the order of consuls' names, giving prominence to ancestors of the imperial house and certain other families. A. J. Festugière, *Amulets magiques*: detailed review of Bonner's *Magical Amulets*. B. Einarson and P. De Lacy, *The Manuscript Text of Plutarch, Moralia 548-612 B*. B. T. Bruère, *Palaepharsalus, Pharsalus, Pharsalia*: argues that *Pharsalia* means the town of Palaepharsalus, near which the battle took place, five miles from Pharsalus. W. C. Helmbold, *Theocritus 15. 87-8*: the use of Doric seems to us undramatic but the dialect, here as in 100-44, is dictated by the artificial tradition of the Sophronic mime. P. Guthrie compares Hor. *Ep.* 1. 14 with Columella 1. 8. 1-2.

DIONISO

XIII (N.S.), 4: OCTOBER 1950

M. Untersteiner, *La tetralogia eschilea degli 'Eolidi'*—*Parte prima: l' 'Atamante' e gli 'Epigoni'*: the story of Athamas, Hdt. vii. 197, reflects an Aeschylean treatment (cf. *μήνις*); *ἐπιγενομένοις* suggests that Aesch. *Epigoni* was the second play of a trilogy in which the first, *Athamas*, contained the death of Ino and her sons and the exile of Athamas; the second, *Epigoni*, told of the return of Athamas and his rescue by Cytissorus from being sacrificed. G. Caputo, *Architettura del teatro di Leptis Magna*: (I) the dedications (with annotations) from the temples of Ceres Augusta and the Di Augusti and from the proscenium of Antoninus Pius; (II) plans and reconstruction of the temple of Ceres; (III) description and reconstruction of the statue of Ceres-Tyche. F. C. Görschen, *De fabula Myrmidonum Aeschylea*: conjectural supplementation and Latin paraphrase of the fragments of Pap. Ox. 2163 on the basis of relevant passages of the *Iliad* and of Accius' *Myrmidones* and *Achilles*. L. Alfonsi,

Gli 'Agrypnantes' di Nevio: suggests the title may refer to learned lucubrations of orators or philosophers, and compares similar play-titles, especially from Middle Comedy; takes *scena* (fr. 2) as 'foro, campo di azione pubblica' and proposes alternative hypotheses for *nocturnos praemiatores*. C. Ferrari, *Saggio di versione poetica dell' 'Edipo Re' di Sofocle*: translation, with added stage-directions and notes on interpretation and readings, of 1186-1222, 1299-1530.

ERANOS

XLVIII. 4 (1950)

H. Frisk, *Zur griechischen Wortkunde*: argues that *ὄναρ* and *ύπαρ* were originally opposed as false dream X true dream (as in *Od.* 19. 547) but that, *ὄναρ* being extended to all dreams, *ύπαρ* (which had originally itself been a general word for 'dream') came to have the opposite sense of 'reality' or 'waking'. P. Haliste, *Das Servitut der Wasserleitung in Platons Gesetzen*: compares *Law 844* (on the obligations of landowners with regard to water-supplies) with what is known of Greek law on this subject. K. Latte, *Ein antikes Gygesdrama*: argues that the 'Lobel-fragment' is post-Euripidean. The fragments of Moschion show a strong preference for allowing mute and liquid to make position, and have the same avoidance of resolution. The vocabulary is not classical (*ἐγρήσσειν*, *δρασθέν*, *προέδραμεν* for *προέδραμεν*, *προάγγελος*, etc.) and the construction found in *φόνου λόχος*, *αισχύνης βοή*, *μύθος πειθοῦς* remarkable. Sven Blomberg collects imitations of Lucan and Claudian in Venantius Fortunatus. B. Olsson notes from papyri *κολπτεῖω* and *διακολπτεῖω* meaning: 'smuggle'.

XLIX. 1-2 (1951)

J. Ernst, *Book-reviews: the bibliographer's point of view*: complains that too many bad or unnecessary books are written and too kindly reviewed, whereas important books often receive inadequate notice. She suggests that a good book should receive a few long reviews rather than many short ones, that authors

should choose their own reviewers, and editors be more selective in choosing books for review. E. Roos, *de exodi Ecclesiastiarum fabulae ratione et consilio*: argues that there are three scenes that ridicule Praxagora's three proposals, viz. the community of goods, the community of women, and State provision of necessities (599, 610, 690); the point of the last scene is the invitation to the audience to dine—at home, and the advice to Bleyrus to procure himself a lentil before attending the State banquet. R. Höistad, *Was Antisthenes an Allegorist?* joins issue with J. Tate (*C.Q.* xxiv); he finds allusions to Antisthenes' allegorizing of Homer in Xen. *Symp.* 3. 5 and Dio Chr. 53. 5; he calls attention to A.'s practice of finding hidden moral lessons in Homer and to an unnoticed fragment in Aelius Aristides (ii. 420). G. Rudberg, *Stratonica*: thinks that [Aristotle] *H.A.* x derives from Strato the views that both sexes provide seed and that *πνεῦμα* plays a part in generation; he suggests that S. was responsible for the reversal, usual in later antiquity, of Aristotle's rule that long eggs are female, round ones male. E. Laughton, *The Prose of Ennius*: uses comparison with other early authors and an examination of Lactantius' treatment of quotations from Cicero to determine where he quotes verbatim from Ennius' *Euhemerus* and where he paraphrases. His conclusion is that only frags. i, iii, iv, vi, vii, viii, ix of Vahlen's edition are verbatim extracts. E. Fraenkel, *Additional note on the prose of Ennius*: compares E.'s fondness for stringing sentences together by *tum, ibi*, etc., and repetitions of *is* with the habits of early Greek logographers and of popular story-telling. Did the Greek *Euhemerus* affect a sophisticated archaism, at any rate in his central section? J. A. Thomopoulos, *Remarques sur quelques manuscrits grecs d'Upsal*: gives bibliographical details concerning codd. gr. 15, 69, 73, 74. E. Fraenkel, *A Marathon Epigram*: proposes in *I.G.* i². 609 (cf. *B.S.A.* xiv. 140) τὸν Μελισσάδην ἢ ἔλεν, ὃν ἔλεσε θόριος Ἄρης?

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

LXXXIV. 1: 1951

H. Herter, *Zur ersten Satire des Horaz*: the source of *Sat.* i. 1 is Greek diatribe which combined the themes of *μεψιμοιρία* and *φιλανθρωπία*. I. B. Pighi, *Emendationes Catullianae*: in Cat. 6 read *nihil ista pudet* in l. 12 and *nec* in 14; 66. 2 read *ortus* . . . *habitus* (*ἀνταρλός* . . . *κύκλους* in Callimachus?); 66. 93 retain the MS. reading; 67. 12 read *verum isti populo ianua, quae ipse, facit*; 68. 99

Troia, obscena Troia are nominatives, *infelice* and *extremo* are both to be taken with *solo*; 68. 157–8 retain the MS. reading in 157 and read *<nunc> a quo* . . . in 158. F. Oertel, *Sallusts Invektive gegen Cicero* is a sketch of a speech by Sallust, such as Gabinius might have made in reply to Cicero's attack on 28 September 54. Sallust wrote it immediately after the meeting of the Senate, but did not intend it for publication. (In an appendix O. proposes in Sall. *Ep.* ii. 4. 2 at *hercule M. Catoni, L. Domitio ceterisque eiusdem factionis multi senatores, multi praeterea* . . .) W. Hoffmann, *Die römische Kriegeserklärung an Karthago im Jahre 218* was made not earlier than the end of May, and was caused not by the fall of Saguntum but by Hannibal's crossing the Ebro. L. Alfonsi, *Sul proemio del Brutus e sulla fortuna del Protagora tra i Latini*: examines passages in the *Protagoras*, imitated in the *Brutus*, and suggests that this Platonic dialogue may have influenced Horace. K. Kalbfleisch, *Sellene Wörter aus Papyrusurkunden*: in P. Iand. occur *ναυλωσις* = *ναυλωτική*; *Τεβεννό[το]λις* = *Ταβεννήσις*; *κοφαλό* [cf. *B.S.U.* i. 344]; *ἀριστήν*; *μείς*; *οἰωνευτής*.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI
ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA

N.S. XXVIII (1950): 4

L. Perelli, *Il carne 62 di Catullo e Saffo*: argues that there is no direct connexion between the epithalamia of Sappho and Catullus lxi, lxii; Catullus is following Hellenistic models which have some Sapphic elements. P. Bosch-Gimpera, *Una guerra fra Cartaginesi e Greci in Spagna: la ignorata battaglia di Artemision*: connects references to wars involving Massaliots, Gaditani, and Carthaginians in Justin (43. 5, 44. 5) with the victories of the Massaliots over the Carthaginians mentioned by Thucydides (i. 14), accepts the conjecture of Munro (*C.A.H.* iv. 389) that the battle of Artemision in which Heraclides of Mylasa distinguished himself took place off Cabo Nao in Spain, and dates the war to the last decade of the sixth and first decade of the fifth centuries. L. Moretti, *Una nuova iscrizione da Araxa*: gives a revised text, with notes, of the long inscription from Araxa published by G. E. Bean in *J.H.S.* lxviii, 1948, 46 ff. and argues fully the case for accepting A. H. M. Jones's proposed dating ('shortly after 189 B.C.'—*ibid.*, p. 53) against the first-century date somewhat tentatively suggested by Bean. G. Pasquali, *L'epigramma fortunato e Cerellio* refuses to accept the proposal made by M. Guarducci (*Riv. Fil.* n.s. xxvii, 1949, 1–2, cf. *C.R.* lxiii.

148) that the distich $\sigma\upsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\ \theta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ was composed by a Cypriote Kerellaïos; a Roman named Caerellius, he argues, borrowed the epigram from somewhere else.

SYMBOLAE OSLOENSES

FASC. XXVIII: 1950

H. Morland, *Zur Vergleichung*: continues his study of the use of cases and particles to express comparison. E. Bickel, *Varii carmen epicum de actis Caesaris et Agrippae: critica in Laudem Pisonis*: seeks to show that Varius Rufus, the first editor of the *Aeneid*, wrote an historical poem on this subject which was overshadowed subsequently by the *Aeneid*, and perished in the third century; he supports his case by emending *Laus Pisonis* 239-40. F. Lammert, *Das Kriegswesen im Panegyricus auf Messala, vers 82-105, sowie überhaupt bei Dichtern, Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern*: considers the relationship of this passage of [Tibullus] iii. 7 (iv. 1) to military writers, in particular Vegetius; the author must have studied the art of war systematically as well as poetry and rhetoric. U. Kahrstedt, *Zwei Probleme im kaiserzeitlichen*

Griechenland: (1) offers notes on the nine Achaean 'states' listed in Pliny, *N.H.* iv. 22; (2) collects information on the 'koinon' of the Achaeans, its history, and its membership. G. Rudberg, *Zum Text der pseudo-aristotelischen Schrift De Plantis*: speculates on the source of this work and compares in detail the Latin and Greek versions. A. J. Festugière, *Une Formule conclusive dans la prière antique*: shows, chiefly by examples from magical papyri, that the repetition of the vocative with *val* (seen, with a different nuance, in Matthew xi. 26) is a fixed formula in ancient prayers. A. Kurfess, *Ad Oracula Sibyllina*: annotates and emends some passages of Geffcken's text. F. M. Heichelheim, *The Mildenhall Treasure II*: continues the attack on the genuineness of the three silver dishes, and prints, with comments, a caveat from Miss Richter. H. L. Jansen, *Notes on the ossuary inscriptions of Talpitho*. E. Eggen, *Militans deo*: on some liturgical occurrences of this reading of the Vulgate at 2 Timothy ii. 4. S. Eitrem: *Varia*: includes a revival of Heiberg's explanation of *Phaedo* 118 a: the sacrifice is due to Asclepius for the easy death for which Socrates had prayed at 117 c.

NOTES AND NEWS

A JOINT Meeting of the Classical Association, the Hellenic and Roman Societies, and the British Schools was held in Cambridge from 9 to 16 August. Some 350 members of the societies attended and a number of continental and American scholars were also present. Lectures were given by E. R. Dodds (*The Idea of Progress in Fifth-Century Greece*), W. K. C. Guthrie (*Pre-Socratic Philosophy*), H. D. F. Kitto (*Greek Literature*), Mme J. de Romilly (*Thucydides*), A. Wifstrand (*Greek Literary Taste in the Second Century A.D.*), Paul Henry (Plotinus), E. D. M. Fraenkel (*The Culex*), F. E. Adcock (*Caesar*), A. G. Lee (*Ovid's Lucretia*), C. W. Blegen (*Troy*), A. J. B. Wace (*Excavations at Mycenae, 1950*), R. Meiggs (*Ancient Sea-Power and Timber Supplies*), H. M. Last (*The Magliano Inscription*), I. A. Richmond (*A Mithraeum on Hadrian's Wall*), R. E. M. Wheeler (*Roman Remains in India*), Miss G. M. A. Richter (*The Roman Copyists*). The Vice-Chancellor held a reception and the Provost and Fellows of King's a garden party for the members, and excursions were arranged to St. Albans, Ely, and Audley End. The organizers are to be congratulated on a highly successful meeting.

The Joint Committee of Greek and Roman Societies has prepared a collection of coins for loan to schools. The collection is arranged in three cases, one of twenty-four Greek coins and two of twenty-four Roman coins each. A descriptive catalogue accompanies each case. The cases may be borrowed individually at a charge of 10s. a week or all three together at a

charge of 25s. a week, plus postage and registration fee. Intending borrowers should apply to Messrs. Seaby & Co., 65 Great Portland Street, London, W. 1, and should state the dates between which they would like to have the use of the coins.

Elsewhere we give particulars of bibliographies of the work of three scholars, Max Cary, Paul Maas, and J. D. Beazley, which have appeared this summer in celebration of the seventieth birthday of the former two and the sixty-fifth of the third. All three are impressive lists; with all who have joined in offering them we hope that to all three much will be added.

C. A. Fahlkrantz (1835-1911) taught Latin at Upsala for thirty-six years. The collection of Latin verse which he himself published has long been out of print: it has now been reprinted and circulated by the piety of his pupil Gabriel Sjögren in an attractive volume of eighty pages. It includes hexameter versions of the *Batrachomyomachia* and the sixth book of the *Odyssey*; most of the other translations are from Swedish and German poetry, but Shakespeare is represented by three well-known passages. Lovers of the art of Latin versification will welcome this tribute to the memory of a skilful and scholarly composer.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Agard (W. R.) *Classical Myths in Sculpture*. Pp. xvi+203; 97 ill. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951. Cloth, \$5.
- Ammendola (G.) *Euripide: Medea. Introduzione, testo e commento*. Pp. xxii+192. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L. 650.
- Arduzzoni (A.) *Poliziano: Epigrammi Greci. Introduzione, testo e traduzione*. Pp. xvi+70. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper.
- Aymard (J.) *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins*. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 171.) Pp. 510; 40 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1951. Paper.
- Beaujeu (J.) *Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle. Texte établi, traduit et commenté*. (Collection Budé.) Livre I: pp. 161. Livre II: pp. xxi+282. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- Beazley (J. D.) *A List of the Published Writings of John Davidson Beazley*. Pp. 27; portrait. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Paper, 15s. net.
- Beckmann (F.) *Der Friede des Augustus*. Pp. 39. Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1951. Paper, DM. 1.20.
- Beckmann (F.) *Mensch und Welt in der Dichtung Vergils*. Pp. 35. Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1951. Paper, DM. 1.50.
- Bennett (E. L.) *The Pylos Tablets. A preliminary transcription*. Pp. xii+117. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Paper, 12s. 6d. net.
- Boulogne (R.) *De plaats van de paedagogus in de romeinsche cultur*. [With résumé in French.] Pp. 104. Groningen: Wolters, 1951. Paper.
- Büchner (K.), Hofmann (J. B.) *Lateinische Literatur und Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937*. Pp. 299. Bern: Franke, 1951. Paper, 23.80 Sw. fr.
- Brandenstein (W.) *Atlantis. Grösse und Untergang eines geheimnisvollen Inselreiches*. Pp. 105. Vienna: Gerold, 1951. Paper, ö. S. 32.
- Broughton (T. R. S.) *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic. Vol. I: 509 B.C.-100 B.C.* (Philological Monographs, XV.) Pp. xiii+578. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press (for the American Philological Association), 1951. Cloth.
- Cary (E.) *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman*

- Antiquities. Vol. VII (Books XI-XX). With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. x+472. London: Heinemann, 1951. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Cary (M.) A Tribute to Professor Max Cary on his Seventieth Birthday. Pp. 36. Oxford: privately printed, 1951.
- Charlesworth (M. P.) The Roman Empire. (Home University Library.) Pp. vii+215. London: Oxford University Press, 1951. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Cilento (V.) Plotino: Enneadi. Prima versione integra e commentario critico. Vol. I (Enn. I, II): Pp. xv+461. Vol. II (Enn. III, IV): Pp. 588. Vol. III (Enn. V, VI): Parte I, pp. 439; Parte II, pp. 662. Bari: Laterza, 1947-9. Paper, L. 1000, 1800, 5200.
- Crosby (H. L.) Dio Chrysostom. With an English translation. Vol. V (Discourses lxi-lxxx). (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. vi+504. London: Heinemann, 1951. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Davis (S.) Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman. Pp. xiii+176. London: Methuen, 1951. Cloth, 21s. net.
- De Jonge (T. J.) Publii Ovidii Nasonis Tristium Liber IV commentario exegetico instructus. Pp. 226. Groningen: De Waal, 1951. Paper.
- Delebecque (E.) Le cheval dans l'Iliade. (Textes et Commentaires, IX.) Pp. 252. Paris: Klincksieck, 1951. Paper.
- De Marignac (A.) Imagination et Dialectique. Essai sur l'expression du spirituel par l'image dans les dialogues de Platon. Pp. 168. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- de Montmollin (D.) La Poétique d'Aristote. Texte primitif et additions ultérieures. Pp. 375. Neuchâtel: Messelier, 1951. Paper.
- Demougeot (E.) De l'Unité à la Division de l'Empire Romain, 395-410. Essai sur le gouvernement impérial. Pp. xvi+618. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1951. Paper, \$5.30.
- De Sanctis (G.) Studi di Storia della Storiografia greca. Pp. viii+198. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L. 750.
- Ernout (A.), Thomas (F.) Syntaxe latine. Pp. xvi+416. Paris: Klincksieck, 1951. Stiff paper.
- Facer (G. S.) Erasmus and his Times. A Selection from the Letters of Erasmus and his Circle. (Alpha Classics.) Pp. 140; 8 plates. London: Bell, 1951. 3s. 6d.
- Farquharson (A. S. L.) Marcus Aurelius: his Life and his World. Edited by D. A. Rees. Pp. vii+154. Oxford: Blackwell, 1951. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Fitts (D.) and Fitzgerald (R.) Sophocles: Oedipus Rex. An English version. Pp. 121. London: Faber, 1951. Cloth, 9s. 6d. net.
- Galiano (M. F.) La Republica de los Atenienses. Texto, traducción y notas. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1951. Paper, 25 ptas.
- Hammond (M.) City-State and World State in Greek and Roman Political Theory until Augustus. Pp. x+217. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Hohl (E.) Um Arminius. Biographie oder Legende? (Sitz. d. Deutschen Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, 1951, Nr. 1.) Pp. 27. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951. Paper, DM. 2.10.
- Huibregste (P. K.) Xenophon: Anabasis. Met illustraties van A. A. Tadema. Pp. 260. Groningen: Wolters, 1951. Cloth, f. 5.90.
- Joachim (H. H.) Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics. A Commentary. Pp. vi+204. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Johnstone (H.) Annales Gandenses. Translated with introduction and notes. (Nelson's Medieval Classics.) Pp. xxvii+105. Edinburgh and London: Nelson, 1951. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Jones (O. N.) Facilitas. An Introduction to Latin Prose Composition. Pp. x+198. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1951. Cloth, 4s.
- Kennedy (E. G.) Latin Unseens from Roman History. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxvii+192. London: Macmillan, 1951. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Laidlaw (W. A.) Latin Literature. (Home Study Books.) Pp. 229. London: Methuen, 1951. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Laistner (M. L. W.) Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire. Pp. vii+145. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 20s. net.
- La Penna (A.) Properzio. Saggio critico seguito da due ricerche filologiche. Pp. 201. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper.
- Latham (R. E.) Lucretius: The Nature of Things. A new translation. Pp. 256. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1951. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Lesky (E.) Die Zeugungs- und Vererbungslehren der Antike und ihr Nachwirken. Pp. 201. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1951. Paper.
- Levy (E.) West Roman Vulgar Law. The Law of Property. Pp. xix+305. Phila-

- delphia: American Philosophical Society, 1951. Cloth, \$5.
- Loem* (J. H. M. M.) *De Nous in het Systeem van Plato's Philosophie*. [With summaries in English and French.] Pp. viii+297. Amsterdam: Universiteitspers, 1951. Paper.
- Lucas* (D. W.) *The Alcestis of Euripides translated into English Prose with Introduction and Notes*. Pp. xix+52. London: Cohen & West, 1951. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Lucas* (D. W.) *The Electra of Euripides translated into English Prose with Introduction and Notes*. Pp. xix+68. London: Cohen & West, 1951. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Maas* (P.) *A Select List of the Writings of Paul Maas, 1901-50*. Pp. 28. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Paper, 6s. net.
- Maddalena* (A.) *Thucydides Historiarum liber primus. Introduzione, testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici*. Fasc. 1: Capp. 1-23. Pp. lxxxvi+98. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L. 1300.
- Marias* (J.) *Aristoteles: Política. Edición, traducción, introducción y notas*. Pp. lxxii+281. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1951. Paper, 150 ptas.
- Martinazzoli* (F.) *La 'Successio' di Marco Aurelio. Struttura e spirito del primo libro dei 'Pensieri'*. Pp. 212. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1951. Paper.
- Merkelbach* (R.) *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*. (Zetemata, Heft. 2.) Pp. viii+241. Munich: Beck, 1951. Paper, DM. 18.50.
- Mette* (H. J.) *Der Pfeilsschuss des Pandaros. Neue Untersuchungen zur 'homerischen' Ilias, mit einer Übersetzung von Ilias 3-7*. Pp. 108. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1951. Paper, DM. 5.60.
- Munari* (F.) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores. Testo, introduzione, traduzione e note*. Pp. xxviii+234. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L. 1300.
- Murie* (W. R.) *Easier Latin Sentences*. Pp. 28. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1951. Paper, 10d.
- Murphy* (N. R.) *The Interpretation of Plato's Republic*. Pp. vii+247. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Neuschwander* (H. R.) *Mark Aurels Beziehungen zu Seneca und Poseidonios. (Noctes Romanae, 3.)* Pp. 141. Bern: Haupt, 1951. Paper, 11.40 Sw.fr.
- Nilsson* (M. P.) *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 80, 1.) Pp. 179. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper, Kr. 20.
- Odeltierna* (I.) *Invidia, invidiosus, and invidiam facere: a semantic investigation*. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1949: 10.) Pp. 94. Uppsala: Lundequvist, 1949. Paper, Kr. 4.
- O'Meara* (J. J.) *St. Augustine: Against the Academics. Translated and annotated. (Ancient Christian Writers, 12.)* Pp. vi+213. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950. Cloth, \$3.
- Owens* (J.) *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*. Pp. xii+461. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1951. Paper, \$5.
- Puccioni* (G.) *Herodae Mimambi. Introduzione, testo critico, commento e indici*. Pp. xvi+196. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L. 1300.
- Radin* (P.) *Die religiöse Erfahrung der Naturvölker. (Albae Vigiliae, N.F. XI.)* Pp. 128. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1951. Paper, 8 Sw. fr.
- Robert* (F.) *Homère*. Pp. viii+330. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950. Paper, 700 fr.
- Robinson* (C. A.) *Ancient History from Prehistoric Times to the Death of Justinian*. Pp. xxiii+738; 138 ill., 83 maps and diagrams. New York: Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan), 1951. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Roos* (E.) *Der tragische Orchestik im Zerrbild der altattischen Komödie*. Pp. 303. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper, Kr. 20.
- Ross* (W. D.) *Plato's Theory of Ideas*. Pp. 251. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Russo* (C. F.) *Hesioidi Scutum. Introduzione, testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici*. Pp. 224. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L. 1300.
- Smith* (F. Kinchin) and *Melluish* (T. W.) *Kepos: Greek in Two Years*. Pp. xiv+298. London: English Universities Press, 1951. Cloth, 9s. 6d. net.
- Smith* (M.) *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels*. (Journal of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, Vol. VI.) Pp. xii+215. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1951.
- Strecker* (K.) *Poetarum Latinorum Medii Aevi Tomus VI Fasc. I. Nachträge zu den Poetae Aevi Carolini: erster Teil*. Pp. 230. Weimar: Böhlau Nachfolger, 1951. Paper.
- Sundvall* (J.) *Kleinasiatische Nachträge*. (Studia Orientalia, XVI. 1.) Pp. 50. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1951. Paper.
- Sutherland* (C. H. V.) *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, 31 B.C.-A.D. 68*. Pp. xi+220: 17 plates. London: Methuen, 1951. Cloth, 21s. net.

- Trypanis* (C. A.) *Medieval and Modern Greek Poetry. An Anthology.* Pp. lxiii+285. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Ure* (P. N.) *Justinian and his Age.* Pp. 262; 16 plates, 5 maps. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1951. Paper, 2s. net.
- Waern* (L.) *Γῆς δόξα.* *The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry.* Pp. 153. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1951. Paper.
- Wilkinson* (L. P.) *Horace and his Lyric Poetry. Second Edition.* Pp. ix+188. Cambridge: University Press, 1951. 12s. 6d. net.
- Youtis* (H. C.) and *Winter* (J. G.) *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis. Second series. (Michigan Papyri, vol. viii.)* Pp. xxii+266; 11 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, \$12.50.

his Lyric
ix + 108.
1951.

Papyri and
and series.
Pp. xxii +
iversity of
d Univer-

Aalto
Ge
adam
Alla
Pla
Fri
Go
Co
oth
M
amata
Ama
Andr
lan
And
Su
Athen
Atzer
Aubr
Aust
Hi
Ax's

Balle
win
Baile
11
Bals
Dr
anc
of
Con
Cae

Barb
78

Bell
Op
53
Euc

Bellin
Ref

Benne
Ael

Bithre

Bluck

Boas's

Stud

Bolhu

Con

Bonne

Amu

Bonne

BOO

Boudi

Bourb

Bouve

Brelic

Brink

d'Aj

Britain

Broad

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Aalto's *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum*, 201
- adamatus, 10
- Allan (D. J.)** on Field's *The Philosophy of Plato*, 23; on Wilpert's *Zwei Aristotelische Frühschriften über die Ideenlehre*, 27; on Goldschmidt's *La Religion de Platon*, 51; on Cornford's *The Unwritten Philosophy and other Essays*, 160; on Nelson's *Socratic Method and Critical Philosophy*, 237
- amata, Amatius, amita, 1 ff.
- Amatucci's *T. Macchi Plauti Rudens*, 240
- André's *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine*, 202
- Andrewes (M.)** Tense Variation in the Subjunctive Mood in *Oratio Obliqua*, 142
- Athenaeum summarized (XXVII), 57
- Atzert's *Cicero, De Officiis*, 189
- Aubretton's *Démétrius Triclinius*, 151
- Austin (R. G.)** on Ernout's *Pline l'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre XII*, 191
- Ax's *Cicero, De Virtutibus*, 189
- Bailey (C.)** on Gigon's *Epikur von der Überwindung der Furcht*, 52
- Bailey's *Lucretius* (British Academy Lecture), 117
- Baldson (J. P. V. D.)** The 'Murder' of Drusus, Son of Tiberius, 75; on Ehrenberg and Jones's *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 40; on Maurer's *A Commentary on C. Suetonii Vita C. Caligulae Caesaris, chap. I-XXI*, 117
- Barber (E. A.)** on Pfeiffer's *Callimachus* (I), 78; on *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (XIX), 80
- Bell (H. I.)** on Peremans's *Prosopographische Opzoekingen betreffende Ptolemaïsch Egypte*, 53; on Roberts and Capelle's *An Early Euchologium*, 54
- Bellinger's *Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report VI*, 1, 121
- Benner and Fobes's *The Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus*, 90
- Bithrey's *Virgil, Aeneid I*, 46
- Bluck's *Plato's Life and Thought*, 86
- Boas's *Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies*, 245
- Bolhuis's *Vergilius' Vierde Ecloga in de Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum*, 241
- Bonner's (Campbell) *Studies in Magical Amulets*, 213
- Bonner's (S. F.) *Roman Declamation*, 197
- BOOKS RECEIVED, 62, 126, 249
- Boudicca's rebellion, 6
- Bourboulis's *Apollo Delphinios*, 242
- Bouvet's *César, Guerre d'Afrique*, 183
- Brelich's *Vesta*, 107
- Brink (C. O.)** on Bouvet's *César, Guerre d'Afrique*, 183
- Britain, Nero's policy in, 4 ff.
- Broadbent's *The Rising of the Gauls*, 47
- Brouzas's *Byron's Maid of Athens*, 244
- Brown (A. D. F.)** Aegisthus and the Chorus, 133
- Brown's (T. S.) *Onesicritus*, 169
- Brown's (W. H.) *Lucretius*, 177
- Browning (R.)** on Rostagni's *Storia della Letteratura Latina* (I), 29; on Castorina's *I 'Poetae Novelli'*, 34; on Cazzaniga's *Note Ambrosiane*, 55; on Gothein's *Boethius, Trost der Philosophie*, 118; on Paratore's *Storia della Letteratura Latina*, 171; on Sedgwick's *Petronius, The Cena Trimalchionis*, 193; on Pellegrino's and Quispel's *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, 198
- Budé Texts: Caesar, *Bellum Africum*, 183; Pliny, *Natural History XII*, 191; Xenophon, *Economicus*, 21; Theognis, 75
- Bultmann's *Das Urchristentum*, 103
- Burn (A. R.)** on Schachermeier's *Alexander der Grosse*, 100; on Vogt's *Constantin der Grosse*, 102; on Instinsky's *Alexander der Grosse am Hellespont*, 120; on Richmond and Crawford's *The British Section of the Ravenna Cosmography*, 121
- Bury's *Sextus Empiricus* (IV), 115
- Buschor's *Das hellenistische Bildnis*, 111
- Campbell (A. Y.)** *Ἀγκάθης*, 129
- Campbell (I. M.)** on Roméro's *L'argument historique et la prononciation du latin*, 56; on Simenschy's *La construction du verbe dans les langues indo-européennes*, 56
- Campbell's (A. Y.) *Euripides, Helena*, 154
- Campbell's (J. J.) *Cicero, Pro Lege Manilia and Pro Archia*, 46
- Carrière (J.)** *A propos d'un compte rendu* (The Budé Theognis), 75
- Cary (M.)** on Kornemann's *Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeer-Raumes*, 219
- Castorina's *I 'Poetae Novelli'*, 34
- Cazzaniga's *Note Ambrosiane*, 55
- Chantraine's *Xenophon, Économique*, 21
- Chrimmes's *Ancient Sparta*, 98
- Clarke (M. L.)** on Whitfield's *Dante and Virgil*, 55; on Pöschl's *Die Dichtkunst Virgils*, 178
- Classical Association, General Meeting of, 125; Joint Meeting with Roman and Hellenic Societies, 248
- Classical Philology summarized (XLV 3, 4), 58; (XLVI 1), 122; (XLVI 2), 246
- Claudius and the Oracles, 7 f.
- Clausen (W.)** Two Notes on Juvenal, 73
- Cogidummnus, 5
- coins, at Dura-Europos, 121; of Ainos, 225; of the Roman Empire, 227; Roman anniversary issues, 229; under Tiberius, 231
- coins, collection for loan to schools, 248
- Colebourn's *Latin Sentence and Idiom*, 45
- Colman (D. S.)** on some school-books, 45

- Cook (R. M.)** The Homeric Epigram to the Potters, 9; on Kähler's *Wandlungen der antiken Form*, 243
Cordus, Codrus, 138
Cornford's *The Unwritten Philosophy and other Essays*, 160
Cox's *Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report IV, Part IV, Fasc. 2*, 56

- Dale's *Latin for Today* (IV), 45
Davison (J. A.) on Rüdiger's *Griechische Lyriker*, 50; on *Symbola Coloniensia Iosepho Kroll oblata*, 93
Del Re's *Plutarcho, Vita di Bruto*, 115
Des Places's *Pindare et Platon*, 17
de Vogel's *Greek Philosophy* (I), 157
DeWitt's *Demosthenes* (VII), 20
Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (I), 11; (II), 235
Dioniso summarized (XIII 3), 122; (XIII 4), 246

- domus, Domitius*, 2
Dover (K. J.) *Pindar, Isthmians* 6. 4: 65
Dunababin (T. J.) on *Peuples et civilisations: histoire générale* (I), 214
Dunlop's *Vergil's Aeneid, Book II*, 46
Ehrenberg and Jones's *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 40
Eranos summarized (XLVIII 3), 58; (XLVIII 4, XLIX 1-2), 246
Ernout's *Pline l'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre XII*, 191
Ernout and Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, 124
Estudios Clásicos, 125
Evans (E.) on *Koopmans's Augustinus' Briefwisseling met Dioscorus*, 118; on *Vis's Tertullianus de Pallio*, 242

- Fahlkrantz (C. A.)**, reprint of book of Latin verse by, 249
Fano's *Teosofia Orientale e Filosofia Greca*, 116
Ferrero's *M. Tullio Cicerone, de Re publica*, 190; his *Poetica Nuova in Lucrezio*, 241
Field's *The Philosophy of Plato*, 23
film-strips illustrating Greek Life, 125
Forbes's *Metallurgy in Antiquity*, 207
Fordyce (C. J.) on *Bonner's Roman Declamation*, 197; on *Herrmann's Phèdre et ses Fables*, 182
Forster (E. S.) on *Lucas's The Medea of Euripides* and *The Ion of Euripides*, 50; on *Murray's Aristophanes, The Birds*, 236; on *Rieu's Homer, The Iliad*, 236
Fraenkel's *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, 147
Fraser (F.) on *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (XI 1), 223
Freeman's *Greek City-States*, 216
Frisch and Toll's *Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report IV, Part IV, Fasc. 1*, 56

- Genita*, 3
Gigon's *Epikur von der Überwindung der Furcht*, 52
Gitti's *Mythos*, 210
Goldschmidt's (G.) *Menander*, 114
Goldschmidt's (V.) *La Religion de Platon*, 51
Gomme (A. W.) *Notes on Thucydides*, 135; on *Jacoby's Aththis*, 82; on *Mantzouranis's*

Oi prōtes êkatasstaseis tōn 'Ellhōn
σπῆ Λέσβο, 120

- Goold (G. F.)** A transposition in *Statius*, 71
Gothcin's *Boethius, Tröst der Philosophie*, 118
Gould and Whiteley's *Virgil, Aeneid III*, 46; their *Cato to St. Jerome*, 47
Gow's *Theocritus*, 164
Grant (M.) on *Mattingly's Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (V), 227
Grant (W. L.) *Cicero, pro Milone*, 98: 9
Grant's *Roman Anniversary Issues*, 229; his *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius*, 231
Graves's *Apuleius, The Golden Ass*, 241
Gregor (D. B.) in *summa*, 10
Gries's *Constancy in Livy's Latinity*, 37
Griffith (G. T.) on *Brown's Onesicritus*, 169
Griffith (J. G.) *Varia Iuvenaliana*, 138; on *Amatucci's T. Macci Plauti Rudens*, 240
Guthrie (W. K. C.) on *Nilsson's A History of Greek Religion and The Minoan-Mycenean Religion and its Survival*, 105
Guthrie's *The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle*, 156; his *The Greeks and their Gods*, 208

Haight's The Symbolism of the House Door in Classical Poetry, 244

- Hammond (N. G. L.)** on *Freeman's Greek City-States*, 216; on *Philippson's Die griechischen Landschaften* (I 1), 221
Harsh's *Iambic Words and Regard for Accent in Plautus*, 32
Hemberg's *Die Kabiren*, 211
Hereward (D.) *Herodotus vi 74: 146*
Hermathena summarized (LXXV, LXXVI), 122
Herrmann's *Phèdre et ses Fables*, 182
Highet's *The Classical Tradition*, 42
Hoffmann's *Platon*, 159
Hopper (R. J.) on *Ryffel's Μεταβολή Πολιτειῶν*, 217
Hudson-Williams (A.) *Two Passages of Lucan*, 68
Hudson-Williams (H. Ll.) on *Benner and Fobes's The Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus*, 90
Humanitas summarized (II), 58
Hutchinson (R. W.) on *Wace's Mycenae*, 48

inscriptions, Greek, 96, 223
Instinsky's *Alexander der Grosse am Hellespont*, 120
 in *summa*, 10

Jacoby's Aththis, 82
Jaspers's *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*, 104

Jones (D. Mervyn) on *Pinner's The World of Books in Classical Antiquity*, 120
Jones (D. M.) on *Aalto's Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum*, 201

Kähler's Wandlungen der antiken Form, 243
Kasten's *Cicero, pro Sulla*, 92
Kerferd (G. B.) on *Chantraine's Xénophon, Économique*, 21; on *de Vogel's Greek Philosophy* (I), 157; on *Hoffmann's Platon*, 159; on *Pohlenz's Stoa und Stoiker* (I), 163

Kilpa

Latini
 (III)
sians
Kinch
Kling
Klotz
Verr
Knigh
time'
Koopr
Dias
Korne
Rau
Kraay
Issues
Kroll
Kurfes

Laidla

and

Laistn

Laugh

term

202

Lawre

Euro

and

Bildn

on *Fe*

Lee (A

189

Loeb C

and

20; I

(IV),

Lucas

tragoe

Alkes

the *N*

Lucret

Kincl

235;

241

Lucas's

Euripi

Luce (J

Maguin

der Au

Manni's

Manson

and *C*

Urchr

ment

Writer

Mantzou

'Ellhō

maritus,

Marmor

Marouze

latine

Matting

British

Maurer's

Caligul

May's A

341 B.

- Kilpatrick (G. D.)** on *Novum Testamentum Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi* (III 2), 238; on Müller's *Lexicon Athanasianum* (1-5), 239
- Kinchin Smith's *The Antigone of Sophocles*, 235
- Klingner's *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, 180
- Klotz's *Cicero, pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* and in *Verrem Act. Sec. IV-V*, 92
- Knight's *Vergil, Selections*, 47; his *St. Augustine's De Musica*, 200
- Koopmans's *Augustinus' Briefwisseling met Dioscorus*, 118
- Kornemann's *Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeer-Raumes*, 219
- Kraay (C. M.)** on Grant's *Roman Anniversary Issues*, 229
- Kroll (J.), *Festschrift* for, 93
- Kurfess's *Appendix Sallustiana*, 185
- Laidlaw (W. A.)** on Harsh's *Iambic Words and Regard for Accent* in Plautus, 32
- Laistner's *The Greater Roman Historians*, 194
- Laughton (E.)** on André's *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine*, 202
- Lawrence (A. W.)** on *Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report IV, Part IV, Fascs. 1 and 2*, 56; on Buschor's *Das hellenistische Bildnis*, 111; on Yavis's *Greek Altars*, 112; on Forbes's *Metalurgy in Antiquity*, 207
- Lee (A. G.)** on the Teubner *Cicero*, fasc. 48: 189
- Loeb Classical Library: Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus, 90; Demosthenes (VII), 20; Livy (VIII), 117; Sextus Empiricus (IV), 115
- Lucas (D. W.)** on Sneller's *De Rheso tragedia*, 18; on van Lennep's *Euripides, Alkestis*, 113; on Sharif's *Three Lectures on the Nature of Tragedy*, 114; on Bailey's *Lucretius* (British Academy Lecture), 117; on Campbell's *Euripides, Helena*, 154; on Kinchin Smith's *The Antigone of Sophocles*, 235; on Ferrero's *Poetica Nuova in Lucrezio*, 241
- Lucas's *The Medea of Euripides and The Ion of Euripides*, 50
- Luce (J. V.)** Plato, *Phaedo* 67 c 5: 66
- Maguinness (W. S.)** on Misch's *Geschichte der Autobiographie* (I), 95
- Manni's *Per la Storia dei Municipi*, 38
- Manson (T. W.)** on Walzer's *Galen on Jews and Christians*, 53; on Bultmann's *Das Urchristentum*, 103; on Wilde's *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers*, 239
- Mantzouranis's *Οἱ πρώτες ἐγκαταστάσεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων στὴ Λέαβο*, 120
- maritus, 2
- Marmorale's *Naevius poeta*, 174
- Marrouzeau's *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine* (III), 119
- Mattingly's *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (V), 227
- Maurer's *A Commentary on C. Suetonii Vita C. Caligulae Caesaris*, chaps. I-XXI, 117
- May's *Ainos, its History and Coinage* 474-341 B.C., 225
- Meiggs (R.)** on Manni's *Per la Storia dei Municipi*, 38; on *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (X), 96
- Memoirs of the American Academy at Rome* (XIX), 233
- Milne (J. G.)** on Bellinger's *Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report VI 1: 121*
- Minio-Paluello's *Aristotelis Categoriae et Liber de Interpretatione*, 26; his *Platonis Phaedo interprete Henrico Aristippo*, 161
- Misch's *Geschichte der Autobiographie* (I), 95
- Mnemosyne* summarized (4th S. III 1-3), 59; (III 4), 123
- Moore's *Livy* (VIII), 117
- Moorhouse (A. C.)** *Latin amata, amita*, 1
- Moricca's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad Fam. libri XVI*, 186
- Müller's *Lexicon Athanasianum* (1-5), 239
- Murray's *Aristophanes, The Birds*, 236
- Myres (J. L.)** *The Rhetra of Lycurgus*, 67; on Jaspers's *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*, 104
- Naevius, biographical background of, 174 f.
- Nash-Williams's *Introduction to Continuous Greek Prose Composition*, 45
- Nelson's *Socratic Method and Critical Philosophy*, 237
- Nilsson's *A History of Greek Religion and The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival*, 105
- Norman (A. F.)** Libanius, *Or. xxviii* 20: 146
- Novum Testamentum Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi* (III 2), 238
- Nunn's *A Short Syntax of Attic Greek*, 46
- Orcades, 7 f.
- Organ's *An Index to Aristotle*, 24
- Otto and Herbig's *Handbuch der Archäologie* (II 1), 205
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (XIX), 80
- Page (D. L.)** on Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (I), 11; on Steffen's *De duobus Alcae carminibus* and *De duobus Sapphus carminibus*, 14; on Diehl's *Anthologia* (II), 235
- Papastavrou (S. J.)** on Brouzas's *Byron's Maid of Athens*, 244
- papyri, 15 f., 54, 78, 80 ff., 164 ff.
- Papyrology, studies in Scandinavia and Paris Congress, 124
- Paratore's *Storia della Letteratura Latina*, 171
- Pellegrino's *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, 198
- Peremans's *Prosopographische Opzoekingen betreffende Ptolemaische Egypte*, 53
- Peuples et civilisations: histoire générale* (I), 214
- Pfeiffer's *Callimachus* (I), 78
- Philippson's *Die griechischen Landschaften* (I 1), 221
- Pinner's *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity*, 120
- Platnauer (M.)** *Dactyls in Comic Trochaics*, 132; on Gow's *Theocritus*, 164
- Pohlenz's *Stoa und Stoiker* (I), 163
- Pöschl's *Die Dichtkunst Virgils*, 178
- Poyser (G. H.)** on Ferrero's *M. Tullio Cicerone, de Re publica*, 190

Quispel's *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, 198

Rattenbury (R. M.) on Turyn's *The Sophoclean Recension of Manuel Moschopoulos* and Aubreton's *Démétrius Triclinius*, 151

Rees (D. A.) on Organ's *An Index to Aristotle*, 24; on Minio-Paluello's *Aristotelis Categoriae et Liber de Interpretatione*, 26; on Fano's *Teosofia Orientale e Filosofia Greca*, 116; on Minio-Paluello's *Platonis Phaedo interprete Henrico Aristippo*, 161; on Shields's *Averrois Compendia librorum Aristotelis qui Parva Naturalia vocantur*, 237

Reis's *Cicero, pro Archia*, 92

Revue de Philologie summarized (XXIV 2), 60

Rheinisches Museum summarized (LXXXIII 2, 3), 60; (LXXXIII 4), 123; (LXXXIV 1), 247

Richmond and Crawford's *The British Section of the Ravenna Cosmography*, 121

Richter's *Archaic Greek Art*, 109

Rieu's *Virgil, The Pastoral Poems*, 54; his *Homer, The Iliad*, 236

Rivista di Filologia summarized (XXVIII 2, 3), 124; (XXVIII 4), 247

Roberts and Capelle's *An Early Euchologium*, 54

Robertson (D. S.) on Snell's *Bacchylidis Carmina*, 15; on Graves's *Apuleius, The Golden Ass*, 241

Robertson (M.) on Richter's *Archaic Greek Art*, 109

Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus (XIII)*, 243

Roman and Hellenic Societies, Joint Meeting with Classical Association, 248

Roméro's *L'argument historique et la prononciation du latin*, 56

Rose (H. J.) on Rieu's *Virgil, The Pastoral Poems*, 54; on Brelich's *Vesta*, 107; on Guthrie's *The Greeks and their Gods*, 208; on Gitti's *Mythos*, 210; on Bonner's *Studies in Magical Amulets*, 213; on Bolhuis's *Vergilius' Vierde Ecloga in de Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum*, 241; on Bourboulis's *Apollo Delphinios*, 242; on Haight's *The Symbolism of the House Door in Classical Poetry*, 244

Rostagni's *Storia della Letteratura Latina (I)*, 29

Rüdiger's *Griechische Lyriker*, 50

Ryffel's *Μεταβολή Πολιτεῶν*, 217

Sandbach (F. H.) Some Manuscripts of Juvenal, 11; on Bury's *Sextus Empiricus (IV)*, 115

Schachermeyr's *Alexander der Grosse*, 100

Sedgwick's *Petronius, The Cena Trimalchionis*, 193

Seltman (C.) on May's *Ainos, its History and Coinage 474-341 B.C.*, 225

Sharif's *Three Lectures on the Nature of Tragedy*, 114

Sherwin-White (A. N.) on *Memoirs of the American Academy at Rome (XIX)*, 233

Shields's *Averrois Compendia librorum Aristotelis qui Parva Naturalia vocantur*, 237

Simenschy's *La construction du verbe dans les langues indo-européennes*, 56

Simon (J. H.) on the Teubner *Cicero, fasc. 8*, 13, 19: 92

Skemp (J. B.) on Bluck's *Plato's Life and Thought*, 86

Skutsch (O.) Two Notes on Naevius, 146; on Marmorale's *Naevius poeta*, 174

Snell's *Bacchylidis carmina*, 15

Sneller's *De Rheto tragoedia*, 18

Sostratus and Sosistratus, 3 f

Steffen's *De duobus Alcaei carminibus* and *De duobus Sapphus carminibus*, 14

Stevens (C. E.) The Will of Q. Veranius, 4; Claudius and the Orcades, 7

Stubbings (F. H.) on Otto and Herbig's *Handbuch der Archäologie (II 1)*, 205

subjunctive (Latin), tense variation in *Oratio Obliqua*, 142

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 57, 122, 246

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (X), 96; (XI 1), 223

Sutherland (C. H. V.) on Grant's *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius*, 231

Symbola Coloniensis Iosepho Kroll oblata, 93

Symbolae Osloenses summarized (XXVIII), 248

Syme (R.) on Laistner's *The Greater Roman Historians*, 194

Tate (J.) on Des Places's *Pindare et Platon*, 17; on DeWitt's *Demosthenes (VII)*, 20; on Τζαννέταρος's *Σύμμικτα Φιλολογικά*, 52;

on Verbeke's *Kleanthes van Assos*, 88; on Guthrie's *The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle*, 156

Teubner Texts: *Appendix Sallustiana*, 185; *Bacchylides*, 15; *Cicero, pro Sex. Roscio Amerino, in Verrem Act. Sec. IV-V, pro Sulla, pro Archia*, 92; *de Officiis, de Virtutibus*, 189; Horace, 180

Thomson (J. A. K.) on Highet's *The Classical Tradition*, 42; on Boas's *Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies*, 245

Thomson (J. O.) *madidis cantat quae Sostratus alis*, 3

Treble's *A Classical and Biblical Reference Book*, 45

Trochaics in Greek Comedy, dactyls in, 132

Turyn's *The Sophoclean Recension of Manuel Moschopoulos*, 151

Τζαννέταρος's *Σύμμικτα Φιλολογικά*, 52

van Groningen's *Vier Voordrachten over de Griekse Tragedie*, 50

van Lennep's *Euripides, Alkestis*, 113

Veranius (Q.), the will of, 4

Verbeke's *Kleanthes van Assos*, 88

Vestal Virgins, initiation ceremony of, 1

vetustas, 9

Vis's *Tertullianus' de Pallio*, 242

Vogt's *Constantin der Grosse*, 102

Wace's *Mycenae*, 48

Wallbank (F. W.) on Chrimmes's *Ancient Sparta*, 98; on Del Re's *Plutarco, Vita di Brulo*, 115

Walzer's *Galen on Jews and Christians*, 53

Watt (W. S.) on Wilkinson's *Letters of Cicero*, 36; on Moricca's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad Fam. libri XVI*, 186

Way (J. A. H.) on Marouzeau's *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine* (III), 119
Webster (T. B. L.) on van Groningen's *Vier Voordrachten over de Griekse Tragedie*, 50; on Goldschmidt's *Menander*, 114; on Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus (XIII)*, 243
 Whitfield's *Dante and Virgil*, 55
Whitlock (G. C.) on Gries's *Constasy in Livy's Latinity*, 37; on Moore's *Livy* (VIII), on Brown's *Lucretius*, 177; on Kurfess's *Appendix Sallustiana*, 185
 Wilde's *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers*, 239

Wilkinson's *Letters of Cicero*, 36
 Wilpert's *Zwei Aristotelische Frühschriften über die Ideenlehre*, 27
Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) on Fraenkel's *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, 147; on Knight's *St. Augustine's De Musica*, 200
Wright (T. E.) on Klingner's *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, 180

Yavis's *Greek Altars*, 112

Young (D. C. C.), (reply to Carrière), 76

Zinn (T. L.) A pun in Suetonius, 10; An emendation in Isocrates, 74

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place

Aeschylus *A.* passim: 129-31; 1448, 1649-54: 133-5. *Ch.* 427, 834: 131. *Eu.* passim: 129-31. *Supp.* 230-1: 67; 381-3, 597: 131
 Ammianus Marcellinus xxix 1 8: 146
 Appian *BC* ii 84: 71
 Aristophanes *Ach.* 318: 132. *Av.* 396: 133. *Ec.* 1156: 133. *Eg.* 319: 132. *Nu.* 630: 74. *Ra.* 1497: 74. *Th.* 465: 133. *V.* 496: 132
 Aristotle *EN* 1098^a 21: 74. *Po.* 1462^a: 4
 Aulus Gellius i 12 14: 1
 Aurelius Victor *Caes.* 4 2: 7. *Epit.* 4 7: 7
 Caesar *BC* iii 104: 71. *BG* i 40 14, iv 8 2: 143
 Catullus xcv 6: 9
 Charisius p. 269 Barw.: 147
 Cicero *Imp. Pomp.* 32: 139. *Mil.* 98: 9. *Tusc.* i 119: 147
CIL vi 24572, ix 6320: 139; vii 1124: 8; xiv *Suppl.* 4533 col. ii 15: 75
 Claudian in *Eutr.* i 59: 142. *Stil.* i 225 f.: 68
 Dio xlii 4 1: 71; lviii 11 5-7: 75; lx 8 7: 69
 Diodorus xix 3 3, 4 3: 4
 Euripides *El.* 1255, *Hel.* 1573, *HF* 48, *IA* 141, *Ion* 366, 1314, 1317, *Or.* 956: 130. *IT* 1487 f.: 147
 Eutropius vii 13 2-3: 7
 Hephaestion p. 269 Consbruch: 132
 Herodotus vi 74, vii 168, viii 73, ix 73: 146
 Homer *Il.* iii 279, xix 259: 67; xxiii 711: 129. *Od.* vi 142: 129; xi 576-600: 67; xiv 494: 130
 Horace *C.* i 10 2, 16 18: 9
Hymn. Hom. ii 480-2: 67
 Isocrates *Areop.* 9, 12, 48: 74-75
 Juvenal passim: 11, 73-74, 138-41. ii 160-1: 8; x 173-8: 3
 Libanius *Or.* xxviii 20: 146
 Lucan i 463-5: 68; viii 560-7: 70; viii 715, 767: 138-9

Lucretius v 818: 9; vi 72: 74
 Lysias xiv 27: 75
 Martial viii 80 2: 9
 Mela iii 54: 7
 Naevius *Trag.* 16 R.: 146
 Orosius vii 6 10: 7
 Ovid *Tr.* i 8 29: 72
 Petronius 110: 10
 Pindar *I.* vi 3-5: 65. *O.* ii 62: 67
 Plato *Phd.* passim: 66 f. *R.* 330 d: 67; 375 c: 130
 Plautus *Asin.* 708: 147. *Cas.* 579, 597: 142. *Stich.* 369: 147. *Trin.* 798: 139
 Pliny *NH* viii 155: 10
 Plutarch *Pomp.* 78 2 f.: 71
 Ps-Plutarch *de Fluviiis* 2: 3
 Propertius iv i 23: 9
 Quintilian i 4 25: 138
 Sallust *C.* 32 2, 34 1, 2: 143. *J.* 85 34: 147
 Sophocles *Ant.* 411: 131. *fr.* 996: 129
 Spartianus *Did.* i 7: 70
 Statius *Ach.* passim: 71 f.
 Suetonius *Iul.* 70: 10. *Tib.* 44: 10. *Claud.* 17 2: 7; 24: 10; 24 3: 69. *Nero* 18: 4. *Vesp.* 22: 10
 Tacitus *Agr.* 5 3: 4; 10 5: 8. *A.* i-iv passim: 145; v 9: 75; xi 18: 69; xiii 55: 70; xiv 29, 31: 6; xiv 38, 39: 4. *G.* 33: 68. *H.* iv 79: 70
 Theognis passim: 75 ff.
 Thucydides i 61 3-4, i 139 1, vii 48 2: 137. ii 36 4, iii 62 3, iv 78 3, iv 128 5, v 9 1, vi 38 3: 136. iv 126 2: 135
 Tibullus ii 3 59-60: 141
 Valerius Flaccus ii 136: 139
 Velleius ii 53 2: 71
 Vergil *E.* v 11, vii 22, 26: 139
 Xenophon *HG* ii 2 19: 146

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀγκάς, ἀγκαθεν, ἀνέκαθεν, 129 ff.	ἔτης, 2	σκαριφήσμοι, 74
ἀλκαθεῖν, 129 ff.	κάνασθον, κánaστρον, 9	σκίραφος, σκιραφεῖον, 75
γαμέτης, γαμετή, γαμέτις, 2 f.	κηδέστης, 2	σώζεσθαι, 76 f.
γενέτης, γενετή, 3	κλαγγή, 149	φυλαί, 67
διασκαριφεύειν, 74	οἰκέτης, οἰκέτις, 2	φυλέτης, 2
διασκιραφεύειν, 75	παρακοίτης, παρακοίτις, 2	χώρη, 76 f.
ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, 66	πρόκωπος, 134	ὠβαί, ὠβάζειν, 67
	σκαλαθυρμάτια, 74	



